
On the Identifiability of Phylogenetic Networks under a Pseudolikelihood model

Claudia Solís-Lemus*

Wisconsin Institute for Discovery
Department of Plant Pathology
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Arrigo Coen

Wisconsin Institute for Discovery
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Cécile Ané

Department of Statistics
Department of Botany
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Abstract

The Tree of Life is the graphical structure that represents the evolutionary process from single-cell organisms at the origin of life to the vast biodiversity we see today. Reconstructing this tree from genomic sequences is challenging due to the variety of biological forces that shape the signal in the data, and many of those processes like incomplete lineage sorting and hybridization can produce confounding information. Here, we present the mathematical version of the identifiability proofs of phylogenetic networks under the pseudolikelihood model in SNaQ [19]. We establish that the ability to detect different hybridization events depends on the number of nodes on the hybridization blob, with small blobs (corresponding to closely related species) being the hardest to be detected. Our work focuses on level-1 networks, but raises attention to the importance of identifiability studies on phylogenetic inference methods for broader classes of networks.

1 Introduction

Background. The Tree of Life is a massive graphical structure which depicts all living organisms. Graphical structures that represent evolutionary processes are denoted phylogenetic trees. In mathematical terms, a phylogenetic tree is a fully bifurcating tree in which internal nodes represent ancestral species that over time differentiate into two separate species giving rise to its two children nodes (see Figure 1). The evolutionary process is then depicted by this bifurcating tree from the root (the origin of life) to the external nodes of the tree (also denoted leaves) which represent the immense biodiversity of living species in present time.

Recently, scientists have challenged the notion that evolution can be represented with a fully bifurcating process, as this process cannot capture important biological realities like hybridization, introgression or horizontal gene transfer, that require two fully separated branches to join back. Thus, recent years have seen an explosion of methods to reconstruct phylogenetic networks, which naturally account for reticulate evolution (see [7] for a review on network methods).

Estimating phylogenetic networks from genomic data is challenging because the signal in the data is confounded by the myriad of biological processes that shape it. Work on theoretical guarantees of

*corresponding author: solislemus@wisc.edu




Figure 1: Left: Rooted phylogenetic tree on bear species[13]. Internal nodes represent speciation events and are depicted with gray circles (usually omitted on phylogenetic trees). Center: Rooted phylogenetic network on bear species [13] with $h = 1$ hybridization event represented by the green arrow. Hybrid node represents a reticulation event and is depicted in green (usually omitted on phylogenetic networks). The hybrid node has two parent edges: minor hybrid edge in green labeled $\gamma = 0.42$ and major hybrid edge in black labeled $1 - \gamma = 0.58$. The reticulation event can represent different biological processes: hybridization, horizontal gene transfer or introgression. Right: Semi-directed network for the same biological scenario in center. Although the root location is unknown, its position is constrained by the direction of the hybrid edges. For example, the Asiatic black bear cannot be an outgroup.

network estimation methods are still lacking (but see [15, 22, 8, 4]). Here, we characterize which types of phylogenetic networks can be estimated from genomic data, thus providing theoretical guarantees to phylogenetic inference methods. In particular, we focus on the pseudolikelihood model in [19], and follow up on their work by providing more mathematical details that had to be excluded for biological audiences. Our rationale for the mathematical details of the proofs is to allow further mathematical developments to be built upon what we demonstrated.

Main findings. Hybridization events create blobs (or cycles) in the network (see Figure 1). We prove that a hybridization cycle can be detected under a pseudolikelihood model only if it spans 4 or more nodes. This rules out gene flow between closely related species, such as sister species. Our work provides theoretical guarantees to the pseudolikelihood estimation of larger hybridization cycles, while bringing up attention to the need for novel models and methods to estimate gene flow between closely related species. The theoretical guarantees for the pseudolikelihood estimation[19] are paramount since it is a highly scalable and parallelizable method which has the potential to analyze big genomic data with high accuracy.

Comparison to [19]. In 2016, [19] published the first pseudolikelihood estimation method for phylogenetic networks, and this work studies the detectability of hybridization events and the estimability of numerical parameters for the restricted case of level-1 networks. However, in this paper, the mathematical proofs of identifiability could not be presented with the necessary mathematical rigor given that the manuscript was published in biological journal. The lack of mathematical details in [19] makes difficult to expand the work to broader classes of networks. Our work fills this gap by providing the mathematical details of the identifiability proofs in [19] in hopes to open the door to future developments on this important topic.

2 Topology identifiability: detectability of specific hybridizations

Our main result characterizes which hybridization events in a level-1 phylogenetic network are detectable from a set of concordance factors as input data under a pseudolikelihood model as in [19].

Our main parameter of interest is the topology \mathcal{N} of a phylogenetic network along with the numerical parameters of the vector of branch lengths (\mathbf{t}) and a vector of inheritance probabilities (γ), describing the proportion of genes inherited by a hybrid node from one of its hybrid parent (see Figure 1). We assume this network is explicit, level-1 and semi-directed as in [19]. See Supplementary Material (Section A) for more details on the network.

The data for our pseudolikelihood estimation method is a collection of estimated gene trees $\{G_i\}_{i=1}^g$ from g loci (ortholog region in genome with no recombination). These gene trees are unrooted and only topologies are considered (no branch lengths). To account for estimation error in the gene trees, we do not consider the gene trees directly as input data, but we summarize them into the *concordance*




Figure 2: k -cycle level-1 semi-directed networks with n leaves. Here we label the edges with $z_i = \exp(-t_i)$ as will be used in the CF polynomial equations.

factors[5]. See the Supplementary Material for more details on concordance factors (Section B), and on pseudolikelihood model (Section C).

Definition 1 (CF polynomials). *Let \mathcal{N} be n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with h hybridizations. This network defines a set of $3\binom{n}{4}$ CF equations from the coalescent model with parameters \mathbf{t} and γ . Denote this system of equations as $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{t}, \gamma)$. If we change the variable of all branch lengths as $z_i = \exp(-t_i)$, then $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma)$ is a system of polynomial equations.*

To show that a given hybridization is detectable, we compare the theoretical formulas of the CFs given by a species network with h hybridization events to those given by a species network without the hybridization event of interest (that is, with $h - 1$ hybridizations). We prove that these equations do not share any feasible solutions, and thus, the same set of observed CFs cannot have been generated by both the species network with h hybridizations, and the species network with $h - 1$ hybridizations.

Definition 2 (Detectability). *Let \mathcal{N} be a n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with h hybridizations. Let \mathcal{N}' be a copy of network \mathcal{N} without the i^{th} hybridization.*

- We say the i^{th} hybridization event in \mathcal{N} is **detectable** if the system of CFs from \mathcal{N} does not match the system of CFs for \mathcal{N}' for any set of numerical parameters $(\mathbf{t}, \gamma, \mathbf{t}', \gamma')$.
- We say the i^{th} hybridization event in \mathcal{N} is **generically detectable** if the system of CFs from \mathcal{N} matches the system of CFs for \mathcal{N}' on a set of numerical parameters $(\mathbf{t}, \gamma, \mathbf{t}', \gamma')$ of measure zero.

Intuitively, Definition 2 says that a hybridization is detectable if the network that contains it and a network without it (but identical to the original network in every other sense) cannot produce the same set of CFs.

Definition 3 (k -cycle [10]). *Let \mathcal{N} be a n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with $h = 1$ hybridization. \mathcal{N} is denoted a **k -cycle network** if the cycle produced by the hybridization has k nodes. The hybridization is also denoted a k -cycle hybridization.*

Figure 2 shows different k -cycle level-1 networks. The subnetworks illustrated as triangles could have any number of hybridization events as we will only focus on a given hybridization of interest in the proofs of detectability. That is, for a network with $h > 1$ hybridization events, as we focus on one hybridization at a time to prove detectability (Definition 2), we will denote a network k -cycle if the hybridization of interest has k nodes on the hybridization cycle.

Next, we list two assumptions for the main theorem on detectability of hybridizations. The assumptions refer to a n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network \mathcal{N} with h hybridizations.

- (A1) All branch lengths $t_i \in (0, \infty)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n_e$ and all inheritance probabilities $\gamma_j \in (0, 1)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n_h$. Here, n_e represents the number of edges and n_h the number of hybrid edges (Section A).
- (A2) Let the hybridization of interest define a k -cycle that divides the taxa on k subsets, each with n_k leaves (see Figure 2), then we assume that $n_k \geq 2$ for every subgraph k .

Next, we present our main theorem on topology identifiability. In short, Theorem 1 shows that hybridization events with 3 or more nodes in the cycle can be detected with the set of CFs as long

as we rule out inheritance probabilities of $\gamma = 0$ or 1 , hard polytomies ($t = 0$) and branches without ILS ($t = \infty$). In addition, we need to rule out single-taxon sampled ($n_k = 1$) for all the subnetworks defined by the hybridization cycle (see Figure 2). All these cases are ruled out by assumptions (A1) and (A2). We will explore the single-taxon cases in Section 2.1.

Theorem 1. *Let \mathcal{N} be a n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with h hybridizations. Let \mathcal{N} be a k_i -cycle network on the i^{th} hybridization.*

- *If $k_i = 2$, then the i^{th} hybridization is not detectable.*
- *If $k_i \geq 3$, and A1-A2 hold, then the i^{th} hybridization is detectable.*

The proof of Theorem 1 is in Section 5.1.

2.1 Single-taxon cases

When there is a single taxon sampled from any of the subnetworks defined by the hybridization cycle, assumption A2 is violated. That is, this is the case when $n_k = 1$ for some k in Figure 2. We found that k -cycle hybridizations for $k \geq 4$ can be detected even if only one taxon is sampled from all the subnetworks. However, 3-cycle hybridizations are no longer detectable, as is presented in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let \mathcal{N} be a n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with h hybridizations. Let \mathcal{N} be a k_i -cycle network on the i^{th} hybridization. If assumption A1 holds:*

- *For $k_i = 3$,*
 - *if $n_j = n_k = 1$ for any $j, k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ ($j \neq k$), then this 3-cycle hybridization is **not detectable**.*
 - *if $n_j > 1, n_k > 1, n_l = 1$ for $j, k, l \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, then this 3-cycle hybridization is **generically detectable**.*
- *For $k_i \geq 4$, if $n_k \geq 1$ for all k , then the k_i -cycle hybridization is **detectable**.*

The proof of Theorem 2 is in Section 5.2. In short, there can be single taxon sampled from any of the subgraphs in a k -cycle hybridization and the hybridization is still detectable for $k \geq 4$. We note that the 3-cycle with only one single taxon sampled on two out of the three subnetworks cannot be detected, and this case corresponds to gene flow between sister taxa.

3 Numerical parameters finite identifiability

For the hybridization events that satisfy the conditions on Theorems 1 and 2 and are thus detectable, we study whether we can estimate the associated numerical parameters (Figure 2).

Parameter identifiability implies that the CFs equations have a unique solution $(\mathbf{t}^*, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^*)$. That is, there are not multiple parameter values that can produce the same set of CFs. Proving uniqueness of solution in polynomial equations is challenging. Therefore, we will only prove *finite identifiability*[17], which means that the set of CF equations have finitely many solutions.

Definition 4. *Let \mathcal{N} be n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with h hybridizations and let $\{\mathbf{t}_{h_i}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{h_i}\}$ be the subset of numerical parameters $\{\mathbf{t}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}\}$ in \mathcal{N} that appear in the hybridization cycle defined by the i^{th} hybridization. We say that these parameters are **finitely identifiable**[17] if there are finitely many parameter values that can produce the set of CFs.*

Next, we present our main theorem in parameter identifiability, which describes that parameters in 3-cycle networks are not finitely identifiable, but parameters in k -cycle networks for $k \geq 4$ are.

Theorem 3. Let \mathcal{N} be a n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with a k_i -cycle on its i^{th} hybridization. Let $k_i \geq 3$ to satisfy hybridization detectability in Theorem 1. Let $\theta_i = \{t_{h_i}, \gamma_{h_i}\}$ be the subset of numerical parameters associated with this hybridization cycle. Under A1-A2:

- If $k_i = 3$, then the numerical parameters in θ_i are **not finitely identifiable**.
- If $k_i \geq 4$, then the numerical parameters in θ_i are **finitely identifiable**.

The proof of Theorem 3 is in Section 5.3. In short, Theorem 3 shows that the CFs contain enough information to estimate the numerical parameters of hybridization cycles with 4 or more nodes. Note that this result depends on assumption (A2). We show in Section 3.1 that 4-cycle hybridizations can become not finitely identifiable when single taxa are sampled from the subgraphs.

For the cases when the numerical parameters are not finite identifiable (3-cycle networks and single-taxon cases in Section 3.1), we propose a reparametrization that will allow us to estimate a subset of the numerical parameters in SNaQ (see [19]).

3.1 Single-taxon cases

It turns out that A2 can be violated in some cases, and parameters can remain finitely identifiable. We only explore 4-cycle hybridizations, since we already showed that parameters in a 3-cycle hybridization are not even finitely identifiable under A2, and parameters for k -cycle hybridizations ($k \geq 5$) can be estimated via sub-sampling with 4-cycle hybridizations (see Lemma 5 in the Supplementary Material Section 5.4).

Theorem 4. Let \mathcal{N} be a n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with a 4-cycle hybridization with parameters associated to this cycle $\theta = \{t_h, \gamma_h\}$. Under A1:

- If $n_1 > 1$ or $n_2 > 1$ (Figure 2), then the numerical parameters in θ are finitely identifiable. We denote these cases **good diamonds** [19].
- If $n_0 = n_1 = n_2 = 1, n_3 > 1$ (**bad diamond I** [19]), or if $n_0 > 1, n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 1$ (**bad diamond II** [19]) then the numerical parameters in θ are not finitely identifiable.

The proof of this theorem is combined with the proof of Theorem 3 in Section 5.3. We note that the bad diamond I had already been studied in [16] in addition to [19].

4 Discussion

Main findings. We prove that hybridization cycles of different sizes vary in their detectability potential. Cycles of 4 or more nodes are easily detected from concordance factors under a pseudolikelihood model, while cycles of 2 nodes are totally undetectable. 3-cycle hybridizations can be detected under certain sampling schemes. In particular, we found that gene flow between sister species – common in real-life biological data – cannot be detected at all. We also prove that we can estimate numerical parameters on the network (branch lengths and inheritance probabilities) for hybridization cycles of 4 or more nodes.

Our work provides theoretical guarantees to the pseudolikelihood estimation of larger hybridization cycles, while bringing up attention to the need for novel models and methods to estimate gene flow between closely related species (small cycles). Our work allows us to promote pseudolikelihood estimation as a theoretically sound method, which is also highly scalable and parallelizable to meet the evergrowing needs of big genomic data.

Limitations and Future work. We restricted our work to the class of level-1 networks. Our findings cannot be extended directly to a broader class of networks, like level- k or tree-child networks[11], because this assumption is crucial for the proof of Lemma 3 which allows us to study hybridization

events separately from each other. More work needs to be done in order to characterize identifiable networks of broader classes, as hybridization events would more readily interact with one another, creating a messier pattern in the CF equations. In addition, our work does not tackle the identifiability of the network topology as a whole, but rather the detectability of hybridization events. Future work will try to provide theoretical guarantees for identifiability on the whole topology which involve comparing whether different networks can produce similar signal in the data.

Finally, our work was restricted to the pseudolikelihood model due to its scalability potential. Yet the identifiability of the likelihood model remains under studied to this day. In the future, we will explore the identifiability of the likelihood model, which we suspect can have the potential to estimate smaller cycles (3-cycles) that the pseudolikelihood cannot.

Comparison to [19] and [4]. As already mentioned, in 2016, [19] published the first pseudolikelihood estimation method for phylogenetic networks. In this work, we studied the detectability of hybridization events and the estimability of numerical parameters for the restricted case of level-1 networks. Many of the mathematical proofs and derivations had to be excluded from the manuscript because it was published in a biological journal. The lack of mathematical details made it almost impossible to build upon that work to extend to broader classes of networks. Our manuscript fills this gap by providing the mathematical details of the identifiability proofs in [19] in hopes to open the door to future developments on this important topic. In 2019, [4] published identifiability proofs for level-1 network topologies. [4] falsely claims that [19] “[...] arguments do not include investigations on network properties such as cycle sizes”, yet [4] corroborates the results in [19] under a different theoretical approach (graph theory), and identifies a combinatorial strategy for inferring networks which later appeared in [1]. In addition to topology identifiability, [19] and this present work prove finite identifiability of numerical parameters (branch lengths and inheritance probabilities), whereas [4] focus exclusively on topology identifiability.


5 Proofs

5.1 Proof of Theorem 1: detectability of hybridizations

Proof of Theorem 1. By Lemma 3 (Section 5.4), we know that we can focus on one hybridization at a time, and thus, the system of CF polynomial equations depend only on the parameters around the chosen hybridization. Without loss of generality, choose the i^{th} hybridization in \mathcal{N} . Let \mathcal{N} be a k_i -cycle network on the i^{th} hybridization. Let \mathcal{T} be the subnetwork of \mathcal{N} obtained by removing the minor hybrid edge on the i^{th} hybridization. The gist of the proof is that we will find under which parameters (branch lengths and inheritance probabilities) does the system of equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, z, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, w)$ has a solution with aid of the Mathematica software [12] (see the Reproducibility section for information on the scripts). Intuitively, if there exist a set in parameter space for which the network and the subnetwork produce the same CFs, then the hybridization is not detectable.

For ease of reading, we placed all large figures and tables in Section D.

Proof for 2-cycle. If $k_i = 2$, then we obtain the following system of polynomial equations by setting $CF(\mathcal{N}, z, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, w)$. Recall that $z_i = \exp(-t_i)$ for t_i branch length in \mathcal{N} , and $w_i = \exp(-t'_i)$ for t'_i branch length in \mathcal{T} .



$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_1 z_{1-\gamma} z_0\right) + (1-\gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_1 z_\gamma z_0\right) &= 1 - \frac{2}{3} w_{0,1} \\ \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_1 z_{1-\gamma} z_0 + (1-\gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_1 z_\gamma z_0 &= \frac{1}{3} w_{0,1} \\ \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_1 z_{1-\gamma} z_0 + (1-\gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_1 z_\gamma z_0 &= \frac{1}{3} w_{0,1} \end{aligned}$$

This system has a solution when $w_{0,1} = \gamma z_1 z_{1-\gamma} z_0 - \gamma z_1 z_\gamma z_0 + z_1 z_\gamma z_0$ for any values of (z, γ) . Thus, both \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{T} can yield the same set of CFs for a properly chosen branch length $w_{0,1}$ for any values of (t, γ) . Therefore, the hybridization in this case is **not detectable**. \square

For $k_i \geq 3$, by Lemma 1 (Section 5.4), we only need to consider the CF equations when $n_k = 0, 1, 2$ in the k_i subgraphs defined by the hybridization cycle. By Lemma 3, these subgraphs can be considered subtrees. By assumption A2, we know that there are at least 2 taxa in each subtree, so all CF equations are well-defined (but see Section 2.1 for cases when there is only a single taxon sampled from some of the subtrees).

Proof for 3-cycle. For $k_i = 3$ (Figure 8), the equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ (Table 1) have a solution if and only if

- $\gamma = 0$ or $\gamma = 1$ (which are the trivial cases),
- or for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, under scenarios that convert the 3-cycle into a 2-cycle or that violate assumptions A1-A2 (see Figure 9).

That is, Figure 9 shows that the 3-cycle hybridizations that are not detectable for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ are those that i) by contracting a branch on the cycle, one ends up with a 2-cycle hybridization, or ii) by expanding certain branches to infinity, the branch becomes ILS-free. This implies that all individuals that are descendent to this branch (say n_1 in Figure 9 top right) will necessarily coalesce, so this scenario is equivalent to having only one individual $n_1 = 1$, and this violates assumption A2. Similarly, all non-detectable 3-cycle hybridizations violate the A1 assumption.

We conclude that all non-detectable 3-cycle hybridizations correspond to 2-cycle or violations of assumptions A1-A2. Thus, assuming A1-A2, 3-cycle hybridizations are **detectable**.

□

Proof for 4-cycle. For $k_i = 4$ (Figure 10), the equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ (Tables 2 and 3) have a solution if and only if

- $\gamma = 0$ or $\gamma = 1$ (which are the trivial cases),
- or for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we need to have $z_{2,3} = 1$ ($t_{2,3} = 0$), which necessarily takes us back to the 3-cycle case (see Figure 11 left), in addition to other conditions (listed below) which simply result in the already studied undetectable cases in 3-cycle hybridizations.

Set 1: 4-cycle with $\mathbf{t}_{2,3} = \mathbf{0}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. The first set of additional conditions has $z_{1,3} = 1$ ($t_{1,3} = 0$) which takes us back to the 2-cycle case (which we already knew was undetectable):

1. $z_{1,3} = 1$
2. $z_{1,3} = 1, z_0 = 0$
3. $z_{1,3} = 1, z_2 = 0$
4. $z_{1,3} = 1, z_0 = 0, z_2 = 0$
5. $z_{1,3} = 1, \gamma^2 z_{0,2} = (1 - \gamma)(\gamma z_{0,1} - 2\gamma - z_{0,1})$
6. $z_{1,3} = 1, z_2 = 0, \gamma^2 z_{0,2} = (1 - \gamma)(\gamma z_{0,1} - 2\gamma - z_{0,1})$

Set 2: 4-cycle with $\mathbf{t}_{2,3} = \mathbf{0}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. The second set of additional conditions has $z_1 = 0$ ($t_1 = \infty$), which takes us back to an undetectable 3-cycle hybridization in Figure 9 (bottom right). The other condition in number 1: $\gamma(z_{0,2} - 1) = (1 - \gamma)(z_{1,3} + z_{0,1} - 2)$ is equivalent to the one in Figure 9 (bottom right) by replacing $z_{1,3}$ with the corresponding branch in the 3-cycle case of $z_{1,2}$. The other condition on $z_{0,2}$ in number 2 is equivalent to the one in number 1 under the additional restriction (i.e. $z_{0,1} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}$).

1. $z_1 = 0, \gamma(z_{0,2} - 1) = (1 - \gamma)(z_{1,3} + z_{0,1} - 2)$

$$2. z_1 = 0, z_{0,1} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}, \gamma z_{0,2} = (1-\gamma)(z_{1,3} - 2)$$

Set 3: 4-cycle with $t_{2,3} = 0, \gamma \in (0, 1)$. The third set of additional conditions has only one: $z_0 = 0, z_1 = 0$ which takes us to an undetectable 3-cycle case in Figure 9 (center right).

Set 4: 4-cycle with $t_{2,3} = 0, \gamma \in (0, 1)$. The fourth set of additional conditions has a combination of $z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0$ which takes us to an undetectable 3-cycle case in Figure 9 (top right).

$$1. z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0, \gamma(z_{0,2} - 1) = (1-\gamma)(z_{1,3} + z_{0,1} - 2)$$

$$2. z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0, z_{0,1} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}, \gamma z_{0,2} = (1-\gamma)(z_{1,3} - 2)$$

Set 5: 4-cycle with $t_{2,3} = 0, \gamma \in (0, 1)$. Finally, the last option for additional condition is equivalent to the $z_0 = z_1 = 0$ case (Set 3 4-cycle): $z_0 = 0, z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0$. Even if $z_2 = 0$, since there are two subgraphs connected to the same cycle node (see Figure 11 left), we are still in the case of $z_0 = z_1 = 0$ in Figure 9 (center right).

We conclude that all non-detectable 4-cycle hybridizations correspond to 3-cycle or 2-cycle non-detectable cases, which cannot happen under assumptions A1-A2. Thus, assuming A1-A2, 4-cycle hybridizations are **detectable**.

□

Proof for k -cycle ($k \geq 5$). By Lemma 4 (Section 5.4), we only need to focus on the case of $k = 5$ to proof hybridization detectability for any case of $k \geq 5$. For $k_i = 5$ (Figure 12), the equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ (Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) have a solution if and only if

- $\gamma = 0$ or $\gamma = 1$ (which are the trivial cases),
- or for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we need to have $\tilde{z} = 1$ ($\tilde{t} = 0$), and $z_{2,4} = 1$ ($t_{2,4} = 0$) which necessarily takes us back to the 3-cycle case (see Figure 11 right), in addition to other conditions (listed below) which simply result in the already studied undetectable cases in 3-cycle hybridizations.

Set 1: 5-cycle with $\tilde{t} = t_{2,4} = 0, \gamma \in (0, 1)$. As in the 4-cycle, the first set of additional conditions has $z_{1,3} = 1$ ($t_{1,3} = 0$) which takes us back to the 2-cycle case (which we already knew was undetectable):

$$1. z_{1,3} = 1$$

$$2. z_{1,3} = 1, z_2 = 0$$

$$3. z_{1,3} = 1, z_2 = 0, \gamma^2 z_{0,2} = (1-\gamma)(\gamma z_{0,1} - 2\gamma - z_{0,1})$$

$$4. z_{1,3} = 1, z_0 = 0$$

$$5. z_{1,3} = 1, z_0 = 0, z_2 = 0$$

$$6. z_{1,3} = 1, \gamma^2 z_{0,2} = (1-\gamma)(\gamma z_{0,1} - 2\gamma - z_{0,1})$$

Note that these equations are comparable to the first set of additional conditions in the 4-cycle case (Set 1 4-cycle), with the difference that here we do not need the $z_2 = 1$ condition ($t_2 = 0$) which simply states that there are no coalescent events on this branch, as in the 5-cycle case, when we collapse the branches inside the cycle, three subgraphs are connected to the same node (n_2, n_3, n_4 in Figure 11 right). So, in the 4-cycle case, we required the $z_2 = 1$ so that more than two individuals would arrive at the cycle node. In the 5-cycle case, even if $z_3 = z_4 = z_2 = 1$, there would be three

individuals reaching the cycle node. The extra condition on $z_{0,2}$ in numbers 3 and 6 match that one in Set 1 4-cycle (number 3) as well.

Set 2: 5-cycle with $\tilde{\mathbf{t}} = \mathbf{t}_{2,4} = \mathbf{0}, \gamma \in (0, 1)$. The second set of additional conditions has $z_1 = 0$ ($t_1 = \infty$), which takes us back to an undetectable 3-cycle hybridization in Figure 9 (bottom right). The condition $\gamma(z_{0,2} - 1) = (1 - \gamma)(z_{1,3} + z_{0,1} - 2)$ matches the Set 2 (4-cycle) and is similarly equivalent to the one in Figure 9 (bottom right) by replacing $z_{1,3}$ with the corresponding branch in the 3-cycle case of $z_{1,2}$.

1. $z_1 = 0, z_{0,1} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}, \gamma z_{0,2} = (1 - \gamma)(z_{1,3} - 2)$
2. $z_1 = 0, \gamma(z_{0,2} - 1) = (1 - \gamma)(z_{1,3} + z_{0,1} - 2)$

Set 3: 5-cycle with $\tilde{\mathbf{t}} = \mathbf{t}_{2,4} = \mathbf{0}, \gamma \in (0, 1)$. Similarly to 4-cycle, the third set of additional conditions has a combination of $z_1 = 0, z_0 = 0$ which takes us to an undetectable 3-cycle case in Figure 9 (center right).

Set 4: 5-cycle with $\tilde{\mathbf{t}} = \mathbf{t}_{2,4} = \mathbf{0}, \gamma \in (0, 1)$. Similarly to 4-cycle, the fourth set of additional conditions has a combination of $z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0$ which takes us to an undetectable 3-cycle case in Figure 9 (top right).

1. $z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0, \gamma(z_{0,2} - 1) = (1 - \gamma)(z_{1,3} + z_{0,1} - 2)$
2. $z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0, z_{0,1} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}, \gamma z_{0,2} = (1 - \gamma)(z_{1,3} - 2)$

Set 5: 5-cycle with $\tilde{\mathbf{t}} = \mathbf{t}_{2,4} = \mathbf{0}, \gamma \in (0, 1)$. Finally, the last option for additional condition is equivalent to the $z_0 = z_1 = 0$ case (Set 3): $z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0, z_0 = 0$. Note that we are still in the case of $z_0 = z_1 = 0$ in Figure 9 (center right) even if $z_2 = 0$. This is because there are three subgraphs connected to the same cycle node (see Figure 11 right).

We conclude that all non-detectable 5-cycle hybridizations correspond to 3-cycle or 2-cycle non-detectable cases, which cannot happen under assumptions A1-A2. Thus, assuming A1-A2, 5-cycle hybridizations are **detectable**. By Lemma 4, we conclude that all k -cycle hybridizations are **detectable** for $k \geq 5$.

□

Given that the solutions to the systems $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ for all $k \geq 3$ depend on hard polytomies ($t_i = 0$), ILS-free branches ($t_i = \infty$), or single taxon sampled for some subgraphs ($n_k = 1$), by assuming A1-A2, we can guarantee that the hybridizations are **detectable** for $k \geq 3$.

□

5.2 Proof of Theorem 2: detectability of hybridizations under single-taxon sampling

Proof. By Lemma 3 (Section 5.4), we know that we can focus on one hybridization at a time, and thus, the system of CF polynomial equations depend only on the parameters around the chosen hybridization. Without loss of generality, choose the i^{th} hybridization in \mathcal{N} . Let \mathcal{T} be the major tree of \mathcal{N} obtained by removing the minor hybrid edge. The gist of the proof is that we will find under which parameters (branch lengths and inheritance probabilities) does the system of equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ has a solution (with aid of the Mathematica software [12]). Intuitively, if there exist a set in parameter space for which the network and the tree produce the same CFs, then the hybridization is not detectable.

By Lemma 1 (Section 5.4), we only need to consider the CF equations when $n_k \leq 2$ in the k_i subgraphs defined by the hybridization cycle.

Proof for 3-cycle. Following the notation of Figure 8 for n_k for $k = 0, 1, 2$, when two of the three subgraphs have only one taxon, the 3-cycle hybridization is not detectable because the system $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ has a solution regardless of the values of t, γ :

$n_0 = 2, n_1 = 1, n_2 = 1$	The system has a solution when $w_0 = z_0(\gamma^2 z_{0,1} + \gamma^2 z_{0,2} + \gamma^2 z_{1,2} - 2\gamma z_{0,1} - \gamma z_{1,2} + z_{0,1} - 3\gamma^2 + 3\gamma)$
$n_0 = 1, n_1 = 2, n_2 = 1$	The system has a solution when $w_1 = z_1(\gamma z_{1,2} - \gamma + 1)$
$n_0 = 1, n_1 = 1, n_2 = 2$	The system has a solution when $w_2 = -\gamma z_2 z_{1,2} + z_2 z_{1,2} + \gamma z_2$

Note that these undetectable hybridization events rule out the potential to detect gene flow between sister taxa.

When only one of the three subgraphs has only one taxon, detectability depends on the sampling (that is, on which subgraph has only one sampled taxon).

For $n_0 = 2, n_1 = 2, n_2 = 1$, the equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ have a solution if and only if:

- $\gamma = 0$ or $\gamma = 1$ (which are the trivial cases),
- or for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we need to have one of the following:
 1. $z_{1,2} = 0$ which takes us back to the undetectable 2-cycle hybridization,
 2. $z_1 = 0$ which is the same undetectable 3-cycle case as Figure 9 bottom right
 3. $z_0 = 0$ which is the same undetectable 3-cycle case as Figure 9 center left (since $n_2 = 1$ is equivalent to $z_2 = 0$)
 4. $(1 - \gamma)(z_{0,1} - 1) = \gamma(z_{0,2} + z_{1,2} - 2)$ which is the same undetectable 3-cycle case as Figure 9 bottom left (since $n_2 = 1$ is equivalent to $z_2 = 0$)

The first three conditions are violated under assumption A1, but not the fourth one. Since the condition in number 4 has measure zero in parameter space, we conclude that the 3-cycle hybridization with taxa sampled $n_0 = 2, n_1 = 2, n_2 = 1$ is **generically detectable**.

For $n_0 = 2, n_1 = 1, n_2 = 2$, the equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ have a solution if and only if:

- $\gamma = 0$ or $\gamma = 1$ (which are the trivial cases),
- or for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we need to have one of the following:
 1. $z_{1,2} = 0$ which takes us back to the undetectable 2-cycle hybridization,
 2. $z_2 = 0$ which is the same undetectable 3-cycle case as Figure 9 bottom left
 3. $z_0 = 0$ which is the same undetectable 3-cycle case as Figure 9 center right (since $n_1 = 1$ is equivalent to $z_1 = 0$)
 4. $\gamma(z_{0,2} - 1) = (1 - \gamma)(z_{0,1} + z_{1,2} - 2)$ which is the same undetectable 3-cycle case as Figure 9 bottom right (since $n_1 = 1$ is equivalent to $z_1 = 0$)

The first three conditions are violated under assumption A1, but not the fourth one. Since the condition in number 4 has measure zero in parameter space, we conclude that the 3-cycle hybridization with taxa sampled $n_0 = 2, n_1 = 1, n_2 = 2$ is **generically detectable**. Note that this case is symmetric to the previously described ($n_0 = 2, n_1 = 2, n_2 = 1$), so it makes sense that both are generically detectable.

For $n_0 = 1, n_1 = 2, n_2 = 2$, the equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ have a solution if and only if:

- $\gamma = 0$ or $\gamma = 1$ (which are the trivial cases),
- or for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we need to have one of the following:
 1. $z_{1,2} = 0$ which takes us back to the undetectable 2-cycle hybridization,

2. $z_2 = 0$ which is the same undetectable 3-cycle case as Figure 9 bottom left
3. $z_1 = 0$ which is the same undetectable 3-cycle case as Figure 9 bottom right

All conditions are violated under assumption A1, and thus, we conclude that the 3-cycle hybridization with taxa sampled $n_0 = 1, n_1 = 2, n_2 = 2$ is **detectable**.

□

Proof for 4-cycle. We only need to prove that the case $n_0 = n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 1$ is detectable. For $n_0 = n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 1$, the equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ have a solution if and only if:

- $\gamma = 0$ (which is the trivial case),
- or for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we need to have $z_{2,3} = 1$ which takes us back to the undetectable 3-cycle case with $n_0 = n_1 = 1, n_2 = 2$.

Given that the condition is violated under assumption A1, we conclude that the 4-cycle with only one taxon sampled from each subgraph is **detectable**. Note that this case does not have the $\gamma = 1$ as possible solution. If we see the equations for $n = (1, 1, 1, 1)$ in Table 2, we see that only $\gamma = 0$ yields a solution in this case.

□

Proof for k -cycle, $k \geq 5$. By Lemma 4, we only need to prove detectability for the case $k = 5$, and we only need to prove that the case $n_0 = n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = n_4 = 1$ is detectable. For $n_0 = n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = n_4 = 1$, the equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ have a solution if and only if:

- $\gamma = 0$ (which is the trivial case),
- or for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we need to have $z_{2,4} = 1$ and $\tilde{z} = 1$ which takes us back to the undetectable 3-cycle case with $n_0 = n_1 = 1, n_2 > 1$.

Given that the conditions are violated under assumption A1, we conclude that the k -cycle with only one taxon sampled from each subgraph is **detectable** for every $k \geq 5$. Note that this case does not have the $\gamma = 1$ as possible solution. This is true because the 4-cycle case is a subset of the 5-cycle case, and thus, similarly as for the 4-cycle case, the equations for $n = (1, 1, 1, 1)$ in Table 2 only have a matching solutions with $\gamma = 0$.

□

We conclude that any hybridization cycle with 4 or more nodes ($k \geq 4$) is **detectable** even if only one taxon is sampled from each of the subgraphs. 3-cycle hybridizations are **detectable** if the one taxon sampled is a child of the hybrid node (and more than one taxon sampled from the other two subgraphs), it is **generically detectable** if there are two or more taxa sampled from the child of the hybrid node, and only one in either of the other subgraphs. Finally, the 3-cycle hybridization is **not detectable** if two subgraphs contain only one taxon. This last condition rules out gene flow between sister taxa.

□

5.3 Proof of Theorems 3 and 4: numerical parameters finite identifiability

Proof. By Lemma 3 (Section 5.4), we know that we can focus on one hybridization at a time. Without loss of generality, choose the i^{th} hybridization on \mathcal{N} . Let \mathcal{N} be a k_i -cycle network on the i^{th} hybridization. Let $\theta_i = \{t_{h_i}, \gamma_{h_i}\}$ be the subset of numerical parameters associated with this hybridization cycle. We use the Macaulay2 software [9] for the proof as detailed below. See the Reproducibility section for information on the scripts.

Proof for $k_i = 3$. The system of CF equations for a 3-cycle hybridization has 18 polynomial equations (Table 1) in 7 numerical parameters $\{z_0, z_1, z_2, z_{0,1}, z_{1,2}, z_{0,2}, \gamma\}$. We know from algebraic geometry [6] that a system with the same number of algebraically independent equations as unknown parameters has finitely many solutions, and thus, the numerical parameters are finitely identifiable.

We define the ideal J of the 18 CF polynomials on 25 variables: the $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^{18}$ that correspond to the CF values, and the 7 numerical parameters $\{z_0, z_1, z_2, z_{0,1}, z_{1,2}, z_{0,2}, \gamma\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
J = \{ & 1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_{1,2}z_2 - a_1, \\
& \frac{1}{3}z_1z_{1,2}z_2 - a_2, \\
& \frac{1}{3}z_1z_{1,2}z_2 - a_3, \\
(1-\gamma) & \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_{1,2}\right) + \gamma\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2\right) - a_4, \\
(1-\gamma) & \frac{1}{3}z_2z_{1,2} + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2 - a_5, \\
(1-\gamma) & \frac{1}{3}z_2z_{1,2} + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2 - a_6, \\
(1-\gamma) & \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1\right) + \gamma\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_{1,2}\right) - a_7, \\
(1-\gamma) & \frac{1}{3}z_1 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_1z_{1,2} - a_8, \\
(1-\gamma) & \frac{1}{3}z_1 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_1z_{1,2} - a_9, \\
(1-\gamma)^2 & \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,1}\right) + 2\gamma(1-\gamma)\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0\right) + \gamma^2\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0z_{0,2}\right) - a_{10}, \\
(1-\gamma)^2 & \frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,1} + 2\gamma(1-\gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_{0,2} - a_{11}, \\
(1-\gamma)^2 & \frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,1} + 2\gamma(1-\gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_{0,2} - a_{12}, \\
(1-\gamma)^2 & \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_{0,1}\right) + 2\gamma(1-\gamma)\left(1 - z_0 + \frac{1}{3}z_0z_{1,2}\right) + \gamma^2\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_{0,2}\right) - a_{13}, \\
(1-\gamma)^2 & \frac{1}{3}z_0z_{0,1} + \gamma(1-\gamma)z_0\left(1 - \frac{1}{3}z_{1,2}\right) + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_{0,2} - a_{14}, \\
(1-\gamma)^2 & \frac{1}{3}z_0z_{0,1} + \gamma(1-\gamma)z_0\left(1 - \frac{1}{3}z_{1,2}\right) + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_{0,2} - a_{15}, \\
(1-\gamma)^2 & \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0z_{0,1}\right) + 2\gamma(1-\gamma)\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0\right) + \gamma^2\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,2}\right) - a_{16}, \\
(1-\gamma)^2 & \frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_{0,1} + 2\gamma(1-\gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,2} - a_{17}, \\
(1-\gamma)^2 & \frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_{0,1} + 2\gamma(1-\gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,2} - a_{18} \}
\end{aligned}$$

It is evident that this system of equations is not algebraically independent. For example, given that the three CFs for a given 4-taxon subset need to sum up to one, we have that $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = 1$ for the first set of three. Furthermore, for tree-like 4-taxon subset, the two minor CFs must be equal: $a_2 = a_3$. Thus, focusing on the first three CF equations, we see that there is only one degree of freedom in $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$, which is enough to estimate the internal branch in a quartet, but not enough by itself to estimate branch length and inheritance probabilities on quartets.

The two equations on the CF values ($a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = 1, a_2 = a_3$) are two examples of *phylogenetic invariants* that the CFs need to satisfy. In order to know the number of algebraically independent equations, we first need to identify the set of phylogenetic invariants in the system.

To obtain the set of phylogenetic invariants, we use Macaulay2 to obtain the ideal generated by eliminating the numerical parameters. The resulting ideal is given by: $I = \{a_1 + 2a_3 - 1, a_2 - a_3, a_4 + 2a_6 - 1, a_5 - a_6, a_7 + 2a_9 - 1, a_8 - a_9, a_{10} + 2a_{12} - 1, a_{11} - a_{12}, a_{13} + 2a_{15} - 1, a_{14} - a_{15}, a_{16} + 2a_{18} - 1, a_{17} - a_{18}\}$.

We denote I as the set of 12 phylogenetic invariants that the CFs need to satisfy on a 3-cycle hybridization. With Macaulay2, we obtain that the dimension of I is equal to 6, restricted to the space of the $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^{18}$. The dimension of an ideal is the maximum length of a regular sequence: set of algebraically independent polynomials[6].

Thus, we have 6 algebraically independent equations in 7 parameters $\{z_0, z_1, z_2, z_{0,1}, z_{1,2}, z_{0,2}, \gamma\}$, and thus, the numerical parameters in the 3-cycle hybridization are **not finitely identifiable**. □

k_i -cycle for $k_i \geq 4$. By Lemma 5 (Section 5.4), it is enough to prove finite identifiability of the parameters of a 4-cycle hybridization because any k -cycle hybridization ($k \geq 4$) can be reduced to a 4-cycle by sub-sampling of taxa. We will show that by sampling two taxa from each of the four subgraphs n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3 , we have enough equations to estimate all the parameters in the 4-cycle hybridization: $\{z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3, z_{0,1}, z_{1,3}, z_{2,3}, z_{0,2}, \gamma\}$. In the following proofs, we follow the same structure as the proof for $k_i = 3$, but not as detailed. See proof of $k_i = 3$ for more details.

Good diamond I: $n_0 = 1, n_1 = 2, n_2 = 1, n_3 = 1$. Here, we sample two individuals from the subgraph n_1 in Figure 10, and only one from the remaining subgraphs.

We have 12 CF polynomials in the ideal on 16 variables:

$\{a_{13}, a_{14}, a_{15}, a_{28}, a_{29}, a_{30}, a_{34}, a_{35}, a_{36}, a_{37}, a_{38}, a_{39}\}$ and $\{z_{2,3}, z_{1,3}, z_1, \gamma\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
J = \{ & 1 - (2/3)z_{1,3}z_1 - a_{13}, \\
& (1/3)z_{1,3}z_1 - a_{14}, \\
& (1/3)z_{1,3}z_1 - a_{15}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1 - (2/3)z_{1,3}) + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3} - a_{28}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3} + \gamma(1 - (2/3)z_{2,3}) - a_{29}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3} + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3} - a_{30}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1 - (2/3)z_1) + \gamma(1 - (2/3)z_{2,3}z_{1,3}z_1) - a_{34}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_1 + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3}z_{1,3}z_1 - a_{35}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_1 + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3}z_{1,3}z_1 - a_{36}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1 - (2/3)z_1) + \gamma(1 - (2/3)z_{1,3}z_1) - a_{37}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_1 + \gamma(1/3)z_{1,3}z_1 - a_{38}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_1 + \gamma(1/3)z_{1,3}z_1 - a_{39} \}
\end{aligned}$$

We note that the set of a values is not consecutive. This is because we use the order in Tables 2 and 3 to enumerate the a_i so that they are consistent in all the 4-cycle sampling cases.

In this case, we have a set of 8 phylogenetic invariants:

$$\begin{aligned}
I = \{ & a_{38} - a_{39}, \\
& a_{37} + 2a_{39} - 1, \\
& a_{35} - a_{36}, \\
& a_{34} + 2a_{36} - 1, \\
& a_{28} + a_{29} + a_{30} - 1, \\
& a_{14} - a_{15}, \\
& a_{13} + 2a_{15} - 1, \\
& a_{15}a_{29} - a_{15}a_{30} + a_{36} - a_{39} \}
\end{aligned}$$

which result in four algebraically independent equations ($\dim(I) = 4$ with Macaulay2), which are enough to solve for the four numerical parameters $\{z_{2,3}, z_{1,3}, z_1, \gamma\}$. Thus, we are able to estimate these four parameters with this 4-cycle sampling scheme.

Good diamond II: $n_0 = 1, n_1 = 1, n_2 = 2, n_3 = 1$. Here, we sample two individuals from the subgraph n_2 in Figure 10, and only one from the remaining subgraphs.

We have 12 CF polynomials in the ideal on 16 variables:

$$\{a_4, a_5, a_6, a_{19}, a_{20}, a_{21}, a_{25}, a_{26}, a_{27}, a_{28}, a_{29}, a_{30}\} \text{ and } \{z_{2,3}, z_{1,3}, z_2, \gamma\}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} J = \{ & 1 - (2/3)z_{2,3}z_2 - a_4, \\ & (1/3)z_{2,3}z_2 - a_5, \\ & (1/3)z_{2,3}z_2 - a_6, \\ & (1 - \gamma)(1 - (2/3)z_{2,3}z_2) + \gamma(1 - (2/3)z_2) - a_{19}, \\ & (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{2,3}z_2 + \gamma(1/3)z_2 - a_{20}, \\ & (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{2,3}z_2 + \gamma(1/3)z_2 - a_{21}, \\ & (1 - \gamma)(1 - (2/3)z_{1,3}z_{2,3}z_2) + \gamma(1 - (2/3)z_2) - a_{25}, \\ & (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3}z_{2,3}z_2 + \gamma(1/3)z_2 - a_{26}, \\ & (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3}z_{2,3}z_2 + \gamma(1/3)z_2 - a_{27}, \\ & (1 - \gamma)(1 - (2/3)z_{1,3}) + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3} - a_{28}, \\ & (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3} + \gamma(1 - (2/3)z_{2,3}) - a_{29}, \\ & (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3} + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3} - a_{30} \} \end{aligned}$$

In this case, we have a set of 8 phylogenetic invariants:

$$\begin{aligned} I = \{ & a_{28} + a_{29} + a_{30} - 1, \\ & a_{26} - a_{27}, \\ & a_{25} + 2a_{27} - 1, \\ & a_{20} - a_{21}, \\ & a_{19} + 2a_{21} - 1, \\ & a_5 - a_6, \\ & a_4 + 2a_6 - 1, \\ & a_6a_{29} + 2a_6a_{30} - a_6 + a_{21} - a_{27} \} \end{aligned}$$

which result in four algebraically independent equations ($\dim(I) = 4$), which are enough to solve for the four numerical parameters $\{z_{2,3}, z_{1,3}, z_2, \gamma\}$. Since we already estimated $\{z_{2,3}, z_{1,3}, \gamma\}$ from the Good Diamond I, we only need to estimate z_2 here.

Bad diamond I: $n_0 = 1, n_1 = 1, n_2 = 1, n_3 = 2$. Here, we sample two individuals from the subgraph n_3 in Figure 10, and only one from the remaining subgraphs.

We have 12 CF polynomials in the ideal on 16 variables:

$$\{a_7, a_8, a_9, a_{22}, a_{23}, a_{24}, a_{28}, a_{29}, a_{30}, a_{31}, a_{32}, a_{33}\} \text{ and } \{z_{2,3}, z_{1,3}, z_3, \gamma\}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
J = & \{1 - (2/3)z_3 - a_7, \\
& (1/3)z_3 - a_8, \\
& (1/3)z_3 - a_9, \\
(1 - \gamma)(1 - (2/3)z_3) + \gamma(1 - (2/3)z_{2,3}z_3) - a_{22}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_3 + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3}z_3 - a_{23}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_3 + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3}z_3 - a_{24}, \\
(1 - \gamma)(1 - (2/3)z_{1,3}) + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3} - a_{28}, \\
(1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3} + \gamma(1 - (2/3)z_{2,3}) - a_{29}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3} + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3} - a_{30}, \\
(1 - \gamma)(1 - (2/3)z_{1,3}z_3) + \gamma(1 - (2/3)z_3) - a_{31}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3}z_3 + \gamma(1/3)z_3 - a_{32}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3}z_3 + \gamma(1/3)z_3 - a_{33}\}
\end{aligned}$$

In this case, we have a set of 10 phylogenetic invariants:

$$\begin{aligned}
I = & \{a_{32} - a_{33}, \\
& a_{31} + 2a_{33} - 1, \\
a_{28} + a_{29} + a_{30} - 1, \\
& a_{23} - a_{24}, \\
& a_{22} + 2a_{24} - 1, \\
& a_8 - a_9, \\
& a_7 + 2a_9 - 1, \\
3a_9a_{30} + a_9 - a_{24} - a_{33}, \\
a_{24}a_{29} + 2a_{24}a_{30} + a_{29}a_{33} - a_{30}a_{33} - a_{33}, \\
3a_9a_{29} - 2a_9 + 2a_{24} - a_{33}\}
\end{aligned}$$

which result in only three algebraically independent equations ($\dim(I) = 3$), not enough to solve for the four numerical parameters $\{z_{2,3}, z_{1,3}, z_3, \gamma\}$. However, given that we already estimated $\{z_{2,3}, z_{1,3}, \gamma\}$ from Good Diamond I, we only need to estimate z_3 .

Bad diamond II: $n_0 = 2, n_1 = 1, n_2 = 1, n_3 = 1$. Here, we sample two individuals from the subgraph n_0 in Figure 10, and only one from the remaining subgraphs.

We have 12 CF polynomials in the ideal on 18 variables:

$$\{a_{28}, a_{29}, a_{30}, a_{43}, a_{44}, a_{45}, a_{49}, a_{50}, a_{51}, a_{52}, a_{53}, a_{54}\} \text{ and } \{z_{2,3}, z_{1,3}, z_{0,1}, z_{0,2}, z_0, \gamma\}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
J = & \{(1 - \gamma)(1 - (2/3)z_{1,3}) + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3} - a_{28}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3} + \gamma(1 - (2/3)z_{2,3}) - a_{29}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)(1/3)z_{1,3} + \gamma(1/3)z_{2,3} - a_{30}, \\
(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - (2/3)z_0z_{1,3}z_{0,1}) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - z_0 + (1/3)z_0z_{2,3}) + \gamma^2(1 - (2/3)z_0z_{0,2}) - a_{43}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)^2(1/3)z_0z_{1,3}z_{0,1} + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - (1/3)z_{2,3}) + \gamma^2(1/3)z_0z_{0,2} - a_{44}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)^2(1/3)z_0z_{1,3}z_{0,1} + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - (1/3)z_{2,3}) + \gamma^2(1/3)z_0z_{0,2} - a_{45}, \\
(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - (2/3)z_0z_{0,1}) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - z_0 + (1/3)z_0z_{2,3}z_{1,3}) + \gamma^2(1 - (2/3)z_0z_{0,2}) - a_{49}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)^2(1/3)z_0z_{0,1} + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - (1/3)z_{2,3}z_{1,3}) + \gamma^2(1/3)z_0z_{0,2} - a_{50}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)^2(1/3)z_0z_{0,1} + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - (1/3)z_{2,3}z_{1,3}) + \gamma^2(1/3)z_0z_{0,2} - a_{51}, \\
(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - (2/3)z_0z_{0,1}) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - z_0 + (1/3)z_0z_{1,3}) + \gamma^2(1 - (2/3)z_0z_{0,2}z_{2,3}) - a_{52}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)^2(1/3)z_0z_{0,1} + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - (1/3)z_{1,3}) + \gamma^2(1/3)z_0z_{0,2}z_{2,3} - a_{53}, \\
& (1 - \gamma)^2(1/3)z_0z_{0,1} + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - (1/3)z_{1,3}) + \gamma^2(1/3)z_0z_{0,2}z_{2,3} - a_{54}\}
\end{aligned}$$

In this case, we have a set of 7 phylogenetic invariants:

$$I\{a_{53} - a_{54}, \\ a_{52} + 2a_{54} - 1, \\ a_{50} - a_{51}, \\ a_{49} + 2a_{51} - 1, \\ a_{44} - a_{45}, \\ a_{43} + 2a_{45} - 1, \\ a_{28} + a_{29} + a_{30} - 1\}$$

which result in only five algebraically independent equations ($\dim(I) = 5$), not enough to solve for the six numerical parameters $\{z_{2,3}, z_{1,3}, z_{0,1}, z_{0,2}, z_0, \gamma\}$. However, given that we already estimated $\{z_{2,3}, z_{1,3}, \gamma\}$ from Good Diamond I, we only need to estimate $z_{0,1}, z_{0,2}, z_0$.

Thus, we can estimate the numerical parameters from different sub-sampling in the 4-cycle hybridization:

- Good diamond I: $z_{1,3}, z_{2,3}, z_1, \gamma$
- Good diamond II: z_2
- Bad diamond I: z_3
- Bad diamond II: $z_{0,1}, z_{0,2}, z_0$

□

We conclude that with the exception of 3-cycle hybridizations and bad diamonds, all numerical parameters associated with any level-1 network are **finitely identifiable**.

□

5.4 Auxiliary lemmas for the proofs of theorems

The lemmas below are used in the proofs of the topology identifiability and numerical parameter finite identifiability theorems. With Lemma 1, we show that we only need to sample two individuals for each subgraph defined by the hybridization cycle (Figure 2) in order to have enough polynomial equations for all the numerical parameters in the cycle. With Lemma 2, we show that some hybridizations on 4-taxon subnetworks (quarnets) produce CFs that can be matched with a properly chosen internal branch on a quartet tree. That is, these quarnets are not distinguishable from a quartet tree with the CFs. With Lemma 3, we show that with the level-1 assumption, we can focus on the detectability of each hybridization at a time, without considering other hybridizations in the network. With Lemma 4, we show that proving detectability of a cycle of $k = 5$ nodes is enough to prove detectability of any cycle of $k \geq 5$ nodes. Finally, with Lemma 5, we show that we can prove parameter identifiability of any hybridization cycle of $k \geq 4$ nodes by showing parameter identifiability of hybridization cycles of $k = 4$ nodes.

Lemma 1. *Let \mathcal{N} be a n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with h hybridizations. Let $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{t}, \gamma)$ be the system of CF equations defined by the coalescent model (Definition 1). Let h_i be the i^{th} hybrid node in \mathcal{N} , which defines a k_i -cycle with k_i subgraphs attached, each with n_k taxa for $k = 1, \dots, k_i$ (see Figure 2). Let $\theta_i = \{\mathbf{t}_{h_i}, \gamma_{h_i}\}$ be the subset of numerical parameters associated with this hybridization cycle. Let $CF_{h_i}(\mathcal{N}) = CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{t}_{h_i}, \gamma_{h_i})$ be the subset of CF equations that involve θ_i .*

Then, we only need to sample $n_k = 2$ from each subgraph to define all the CF equations in $CF_{h_i}(\mathcal{N})$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we choose a hybridization cycle with 3 nodes ($k_i = 3$). See Figure 2. This 3-cycle defines 3 subgraphs with number of taxa n_0, n_1, n_2 respectively. The complete system

of CF equations of the network is produced by taking every possible 4-taxon subset $\{a, b, c, d\}$ and write its corresponding three CF equations: $CF_{ab|cd}, CF_{ac|bd}, CF_{ad|bc}$ as described in Section C. However, we are interested only in the CF equations that include the parameters related to the i^{th} hybridization event: $\theta_i = \{z_1^{(i)}, z_{1,2}^{(i)}, z_2^{(i)}, z_{0,1}^{(i)}, z_{0,2}^{(i)}, z_0^{(i)}, \gamma^{(i)}\}$.


Note that if we take 4 taxa from the same subgraph (say the one labeled n_0), then none of the CF equations will involve any parameters in θ_i . Similarly, if we take 3 taxa from the same subgraph (say n_0), and one taxon from a different subgraph (say n_1), then the edge connecting the one taxon in n_1 to the others will indeed contain parameters in θ_i ($z_0^{(i)}, z_{0,1}^{(i)}, z_1^{(i)}$). However, this edge will be an external edge, and as we know from the coalescent model, only internal edges play a role in the CF formulas. Thus, no parameters in θ_i will actually appear in the CF formulas when taking all 4 taxa from the same subgraph, or when taking 3 taxa from one subgraph and one from another. This means that only the CF equations from 4-taxon subsets in which at most 2 taxa belong to the same subgraph include the parameters in θ_i . Thus, the subset of CF equations corresponding to the hybridization event ($CF_{h_i}(\mathcal{N})$) can be fully defined by having $n_0 = n_1 = n_2 = 2$. \square

Lemma 2. *Let \mathcal{Q} be a 4-taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed network with one hybridization event. Assume that \mathcal{Q} is of type 1, 2, 4 or 5 in Figure 7. Let $CF(\mathcal{Q}, \mathbf{t}, \gamma)$ be the set of three CF equations for \mathcal{Q} . Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ be the major quartet obtained by removing the minor hybrid edge ($\gamma < 0.5$) in \mathcal{Q} , and let $CF(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\mathbf{t}})$ be the set of three CF equations for $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q}}$.*

Then, $CF(\mathcal{Q}, \mathbf{t}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\mathbf{t}})$ for a properly chosen branch length \tilde{t} in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q}}$.


Proof. If \mathcal{Q} is a type 5 network, the proof is trivial as the CF match directly those from a quartet tree.

For type 1, 2 and 4, below we see the formulas to choose the internal branch in a quartet tree (\tilde{t}_1 in the Figures) to match the CFs of these quartets. As in the remainder of the paper, here $z_i = \exp(-t_i)$.




$$\exp(-\tilde{t}_1) := 1 + \gamma z_3 - \gamma^2 z_4 - \gamma^2 z_3 - (1 - \gamma)^2 z_2$$

Type 1



$$\exp(-\tilde{t}_1) := 1 - \gamma z_2$$

Type 2



$$\exp(-\tilde{t}_1) := \exp(-t_2)[1 - \gamma^2 z_4 - (1 - \gamma)^2 z_3]$$

Type 4

\square

Lemma 3. *Let \mathcal{N} be a n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with h hybridizations. Let $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{t}, \gamma)$ be the system of CF equations defined by the coalescent model (Definition 1). Let h_i be the i^{th} hybrid node of interest, which defines a k_i -cycle, and let*

$\theta_i = \{\mathbf{t}_{h_i}, \gamma_{h_i}\}$ be the subset of numerical parameters associated with this hybridization cycle. Define $CF_{h_i}(\mathcal{N}) = CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{t}_{h_i}, \gamma_{h_i})$ as the subset of CF equations that involve θ_i . Let \mathcal{N}_{h_i} be a network with only $h = 1$ hybridization, the hybridization of interest in \mathcal{N} , and define $CF_{h_i}(\mathcal{N}_{h_i}) = CF(\mathcal{N}_{h_i}, \mathbf{t}_{h_i}, \gamma_{h_i})$ as the CF equations concerning the one hybridization in \mathcal{N}_{h_i} .

Then, $CF_{h_i}(\mathcal{N}_{h_i}) = CF_{h_i}(\mathcal{N})$. That is, the CF equations corresponding to the i^{th} hybridization on the whole network \mathcal{N} are the same as the CF equations from \mathcal{N}_{h_i} (network with only one hybridization).

Proof. By Lemma 1, $CF_{h_i}(\mathcal{N})$ and $CF_{h_i}(\mathcal{N}_{h_i})$ are completely defined by 4-taxon subsets with at most 2 taxa per subgraph defined by the k_i -cycle. Let $s = \{a, b, c, d\}$ be one of those 4-taxon subsets. Without loss of generality, assume that a, b belong to subgraph n_k and c, d belong to subgraph $n_{k'}$. Since \mathcal{N} has other hybridization events, let's assume that a, b are linked by another hybridization inside the n_k subgraph. By the level-1 assumption, the hybridization event involving a, b needs to be contained inside the n_k subgraph, and thus, it can only be of type 1, 2, 4 or 5 in Figure 7 (because type 3 hybridization involves three taxa, not only two). By Lemma 2, this hybridization has the same CF equations as a properly chosen tree, and thus, we can remove all hybridization events in the subgraphs of \mathcal{N} and replace the subgraphs by subtrees. We obtain \mathcal{N}_{h_i} from \mathcal{N} in this way, and thus, $CF_{h_i}(\mathcal{N}_{h_i}) = CF_{h_i}(\mathcal{N})$. \square

Lemma 4. Let \mathcal{N} be a n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with $h = 1$ hybridization that defines a hybridization cycle of $k \geq 5$ nodes. Let $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{t}, \gamma)$ be the system of CF equations defined by the coalescent model (Definition 1). Let \mathcal{T} be the major tree obtained by removing the minor hybrid edge in \mathcal{N} . Proving $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{t}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{t}')$ (hybridization detectability) is equivalent to proving hybridization detectability on a 5-cycle network ($\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$) constructed from \mathcal{N} by removing the $k - 5$ subgraphs connected to the hybridization cycle farthest from the hybrid node (compare Figure 12 to 3).

Proof. Without loss of generality, we will consider \mathcal{N} to have an 8-cycle hybridization (Figure 3 left) with major tree \mathcal{T} (Figure 3 right). When matching $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{t}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{t}')$, we can select 4-taxon subsets that would provide equalities for the parameters far from the hybrid node. For example, by selecting the 4-taxon subset with $n_2 = 1, n_4 = 2$ and $n_6 = 1$, we get directly the equality: $z_4 = w_4$. Similarly, we can choose 4-taxon subsets to produce the equalities: $z_6 = w_6, z_7 = w_7, z_5 = w_5$ and $z_3 = w_3$. In addition, if we select the 4-taxon subset with $n_4 = n_6 = 2$, we get the equality $z_6 z_{4,6} z_4 = w_6 w_{4,6} w_4$ which yields $z_{4,6} = w_{4,6}$ given the $z_4 = w_4$ and $z_6 = w_6$ equalities. Following the same procedure, we obtain the equalities related to the other edges in the cycle that are far from the hybrid node: $z_i = w_i$ for $i = (6, 7), (5, 7), (3, 5)$.

We conclude that when considering the above equalities between \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{T} , we only need equalities relating the parameters z_i for $i = (1, 3), (0, 1)(0, 2), (2, 4), 0, 1, 2$, which corresponds to the 5-cycle hybridization of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$. Thus, the CF equations for a k -cycle for $k \geq 5$ are equivalent to a 5-cycle hybridization when studying the detectability of the hybridization.




Figure 3: 8-cycle network and its corresponding tree representation.

\square

Lemma 5. Let \mathcal{N} be a n -taxon explicit level-1 semi-directed phylogenetic network with $h = 1$ hybridization that defines a hybridization cycle of $k \geq 4$ nodes. Let $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{t}, \gamma)$ be the system of CF

equations defined by the coalescent model around the hybridization cycle (Definition 1). Then, the polynomial equations in $CF(\mathcal{N}, t, \gamma)$ can be decomposed into subsets of equations: $\{CF_i(\mathcal{N}, t_i, \gamma)\}$ each corresponding to a 4-cycle hybridization obtained by ignoring certain n_k subgraphs at a time.

Proof. It is enough to prove finite identifiability of the parameters of a 4-cycle hybridization because any k -cycle hybridization ($k \geq 4$) can be reduced to a 4-cycle by sub-sampling of taxa. For example, in the 8-cycle hybridization in Figure 3, we can estimate any parameters with a properly chosen sub-sample of taxa.

By Lemma 1, we only need to sample 2 individuals per subgraph. Let us choose the 4-cycle hybridization with $n_0 = n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 2, n_4 = n_5 = n_6 = n_7 = 0$, then the CF equations ($CF_{0,1,2,3}(\mathcal{N})$ for short) of this 4-cycle hybridization will only depend on the parameters $\{z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3\}$ along with the branch lengths inside the cycle $\{z_{1,3}, z_{0,1}, z_{0,2}, \tilde{z}\}$ with $\tilde{z} = z_{2,4} + z_{4,6} + z_{6,7} + z_{5,7} + z_{3,5}$. Thus, we can study the finite identifiability of $\{z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3, z_{1,3}, z_{0,1}, z_{0,2}, \tilde{z}\}$ using only the equations in $CF_{0,1,2,3}(\mathcal{N})$. We can repeat this process with a different 4-taxon subset covering a different set of parameters until every parameter in (t, γ) is included in at least one subset of CF equations. □

Reproducibility

All Macaulay2 and Mathematica scripts are available in the GitHub repository <https://github.com/solislemuslab/snaq-identifiability> (link will be made publicly available after publication).

References

- [1] Elizabeth S. Allman, Hector Baños, and John A. Rhodes. Nanuq: a method for inferring species networks from gene trees under the coalescent model. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 14(1):24, 2019.
- [2] Elizabeth S. Allman, James H. Degnan, and John A. Rhodes. Identifying the rooted species tree from the distribution of unrooted gene trees under the coalescent. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 62(6):833–862, 2011.
- [3] Cécile Ané, Bret Larget, David A Baum, Stacey D Smith, and Antonis Rokas. Bayesian estimation of concordance among gene trees. *Molecular biology and evolution*, 24(2):412–26, mar 2007.
- [4] Hector Baños. Identifying species network features from gene tree quartets under the coalescent model. *Bulletin of mathematical biology*, 81(2):494–534, 02 2019.
- [5] David A Baum. Concordance trees, concordance factors, and the exploration of reticulate genealogy. *Taxon*, 56(May):417–426, 2007.
- [6] David Cox, John Little, and Donal O’Shea. *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms*. Springer, third edition, 2007.
- [7] James H Degnan. Modeling Hybridization Under the Network Multispecies Coalescent. *Systematic Biology*, 67(5):786–799, 05 2018.
- [8] Andrew Francis and Vincent Moulton. Identifiability of tree-child phylogenetic networks under a probabilistic recombination-mutation model of evolution. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 446:160–167, 2018.
- [9] DR Grayson and ME Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>.
- [10] Katharina T. Huber, Vincent Moulton, Charles Semple, and Taoyang Wu. Quartet inference rules for level-1 networks. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 80(8):2137–2153, 2018.
- [11] Daniel Huson, Regula Rupp, and Celine Scornavacca. *Phylogenetic Networks*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, first edition, 2010.
- [12] Wolfram Research, Inc. Mathematica, Version 12.0. Champaign, IL, 2019.

- [13] Vikas Kumar, Fritjof Lammers, Tobias Bidon, Markus Pfenninger, Lydia Kolter, Maria A. Nilsson, and Axel Janke. The evolutionary history of bears is characterized by gene flow across species. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1):46487, 2017.
- [14] Chen Meng and Laura Salter Kubatko. Detecting hybrid speciation in the presence of incomplete lineage sorting using gene tree incongruence: a model. *Theoretical population biology*, 75(1):35–45, mar 2009.
- [15] Fabio Pardi and Celine Scornavacca. Reconstructible Phylogenetic Networks: Do Not Distinguish the Indistinguishable. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 11(4):e1004135, 2015.
- [16] JK Joseph K. Pickrell and JK Jonathan K. Pritchard. Inference of population splits and mixtures from genome-wide allele frequency data. *PLoS genetics*, 8(11):e1002967, jan 2012.
- [17] D. L. Pimentel-Alarcón, N. Boston, and R. D. Nowak. A characterization of deterministic sampling patterns for low-rank matrix completion. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 10(4):623–636, 2016.
- [18] C. Solís-Lemus, P. Bastide, and C. Ané. PhyloNetworks: a package for phylogenetic networks. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 34(12):3292–3298, 2017.
- [19] Claudia Solís-Lemus and Cécile Ané. Inferring phylogenetic networks with maximum pseudo-likelihood under incomplete lineage sorting. *PLOS Genetics*, 12(3):e1005896, 2016.
- [20] Yun Yu, James H. Degnan, and Luay Nakhleh. The probability of a gene tree topology within a phylogenetic network with applications to hybridization detection. *PLoS genetics*, 8(4):e1002660, jan 2012.
- [21] Yun Yu, Jianrong Dong, Kevin J Liu, and Luay Nakhleh. Maximum Likelihood Inference of Reticulate Evolutionary Histories. *PNAS*, 111(46):16448–16453, 2014.
- [22] Sha Zhu and James H. Degnan. Displayed Trees Do Not Determine Distinguishability Under the Network Multispecies Coalescent. *Systematic Biology*, 66(2):283–298, 12 2016.

Supplementary Material

On the Identifiability of Phylogenetic Networks under a Pseudolikelihood model

A Definitions and notations

Our main parameter of interest is the topology \mathcal{N} of a phylogenetic network along with the numerical parameters of the vector of branch lengths (\mathbf{t}) and a vector of inheritance probabilities ($\boldsymbol{\gamma}$), describing the proportion of genes inherited by a hybrid node from one of its hybrid parent (see Figure 1).

A rooted explicit phylogenetic network \mathcal{N} on taxon set X is a connected directed acyclic graph with vertices $V = \{r\} \cup V_L \cup V_H \cup V_T$, edges $E = E_H \cup E_T$ and a bijective leaf-labeling function $f: V_L \rightarrow X$ with the following characteristics:

- The root r has indegree 0 and outdegree 2
- Any leaf $v \in V_L$ has indegree 1 and outdegree 0
- Any tree node $v \in V_T$ has indegree 1 and outdegree 2
- Any hybrid node $v \in V_H$ has indegree 2 and outdegree 1
- A tree edge $e \in E_T$ is an edge whose child is a tree node
- A hybrid edge $e \in E_H$ is an edge whose child is a hybrid node
- A hybrid edge $e \in E_H$ has an inheritance probability parameter $\gamma_e < 1$ which represents the proportion of the genetic material that the child hybrid node received from this parent edge. For a tree edge e , $\gamma_e = 1$

In a rooted explicit network, every internal node represents a biological mechanism: speciation for tree nodes and hybridization for hybrid nodes. However, other types of phylogenetic network also exist in literature, such as unrooted networks [11] and semi-directed networks [19]. Unrooted phylogenetic networks are typically obtained by suppressing the root node and the direction of all edges. In semi-directed networks, on the other hand, the root node is suppressed and we ignore the direction of all tree edges, but we maintain the direction of hybrid edges, thus keeping information on which nodes are hybrids. The placement of the root is then constrained, because the direction of the two hybrid edges to a given hybrid node inform the direction of time at this node: the third edge must be a tree edge directed away from the hybrid node and leading to all the hybrid's descendants. Therefore the root cannot be placed on any descendant of any hybrid node, although it might be placed on some hybrid edges. See Figure 1 for the example of a rooted explicit phylogenetic network (center), and its semi-directed version (right).

Assume that \mathcal{N} has n species and h hybridization events (that is, $|V_h| = h$). Each hybridization event creates a blob (or cycle) which represents a subgraph with at least two nodes and no cut-edges. A cut-edge is any edge in the network whose removal disconnects the network. Traditionally, the term *cycle* is used for directed (rooted) networks, and the term *blob* is used for undirected (unrooted) networks. We make no distinction here as we will focus on *semi-directed* networks, and thus, some edges in the cycle (blob) will be directed, and some will not. Let k_i be the number of nodes in the i^{th} hybridization cycle (for $i = 1, 2, \dots, h$), so that this hybridization is denoted k_i -cycle hybridization. For example, in Figure 1 (right) $n = 6$, $h = 1$, $k_1 = 3$.

We further assume that the phylogenetic network is of level-1 [11], i.e. any given edge can be part of at most one cycle. This means that there is no overlap between any two cycles (see Figure 4).




Figure 4: Left: Level-1 network vs Right: non-level-1 network

Thus, our parameters of interest are $(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{t}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ where

- \mathcal{N} is an explicit semi-directed level-1 phylogenetic network that links the n species under study, and has h hybridization events. This network has two vectors of numerical parameters:
- branch lengths $\mathbf{t} \in [0, \infty)^{n_e}$ for n_e branches in the network, and
- inheritance probabilities $\gamma \in [0, 1]^{n_h}$ for n_h minor hybrid edges.

Note that for every hybridization event, there are two parent hybrid edges connected to the hybrid node: 1) major hybrid edge with inheritance probability $\gamma > 0.5$, and 2) a minor hybrid edge with inheritance probability $\gamma < 0.5$. Both edges are parametrized with the same γ .

B Concordance factor (CF) data

The data for our pseudolikelihood estimation method is a collection of estimated gene trees $\{G_i\}_{i=1}^g$ from g loci (ortholog region in genome with no recombination). These gene trees are unrooted and only topologies are considered (no branch lengths). To account for estimation error in the gene trees, we do not consider the gene tree directly as input data, but we summarize them into the *concordance factors* (CF) [5] for every possible quartet. A quartet is a 4-taxon unrooted tree. For example, for taxon set $s = \{a, b, c, d\}$, there are only three possible quartets, represented by the splits $q_1 = ab|cd$, $q_2 = ac|bd$ and $q_3 = ad|bc$. The CF of a given quartet is the proportion of genes whose true tree displays that quartet (see Figure 5). When these CFs are estimated in BUCKy [3], they represent true genomic discordance, and naturally account for the estimation error in the gene trees. Our pseudolikelihood method (SNaQ [19, 18]) uses these observed CFs as input data to estimate a species network. SNaQ finds the best network that fits the data by identifying the network whose theoretical CFs are close to the observed CFs. More details about the model are presented in the Section C.




Figure 5: Example of computation of concordance factors from a sample of 5 gene trees. For the 4-taxon subset $\{A, B, C, D\}$, there are three possible quartets: $AB|CD$, $AC|BD$, $AD|BC$ with observed CFs of $(3/5, 1/5, 1/5)$. This estimation of CFs is not robust to estimation error as we consider the gene trees as perfectly reconstructed. Alternatively, we can estimate the CFs with BUCKy[3] which accounts for gene tree estimation error.

C Probability model for gene trees

Here, we define the pseudolikelihood function for $(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{t}, \gamma)$ given the estimated CFs as data. Most of this section is an extract from [19] (except for Section C.2.1) and presented here for the sake of completeness.

The pseudolikelihood of a network is based on the likelihood of its 4-taxon subnetworks (*quartets* in [10]). That is, for a given network \mathcal{N} with $n \geq 4$ taxa, we consider all 4-taxon subsets $\mathcal{S} = \{s =$




Figure 6: Rooted 4-taxon network (left) and its semi-directed version (center). Quartet CFs expected under the network do not depend on the root placement, and are weighted averages of quartet CFs expected under the unrooted trees (right).

$\{a, b, c, d\} : a, b, c, d \in X$ and combine the likelihood of each 4-taxon subnetworks to form the full network pseudolikelihood:

$$\tilde{L}(\mathcal{N}) = \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} L(s) \quad (1)$$

where $L(s)$ is the likelihood of the subnetwork of a given 4-taxon subset s . These 4-taxon likelihoods are not independent, which is why we get a pseudolikelihood when we multiply them, instead of a true likelihood.

To calculate the likelihood of a given 4-taxon subset $s = \{a, b, c, d\}$, let $Y = (Y_{q_1}, Y_{q_2}, Y_{q_3})$ denote the number of gene trees that match each of the three possible quartet resolutions: $q_1 = ab|cd$, $q_2 = ac|bd$, $q_3 = ad|bc$, then Y follows a multinomial distribution with probabilities $(CF_{q_1}, CF_{q_2}, CF_{q_3})$, the theoretical CFs expected under the coalescent on the 4-taxon subnetwork which were derived in [19] under the multispecies coalescent model on networks [14, 20, 21].

Thus, the likelihood of a given 4-taxon subset is 1, we get:

$$L(s) \propto (CF_{q_1})^{Y_{q_1}} (CF_{q_2})^{Y_{q_2}} (CF_{q_3})^{Y_{q_3}} \quad (2)$$

The data are summarized in the Y values through the estimated CFs, and the candidate network governs the CF values, which we explain below.

C.1 The multispecies coalescent network (MSCN) model

The theoretical CFs expected under the coalescent model are already derived for a species tree in [2], and for a species network in [19]. In both cases, the CFs do not depend on the position of the root. For the tree, the major CF is defined for the quartet that agrees with the species tree. That is, if the species tree has the split $ab|cd$ with internal edge t , then the major CF would be $CF_{ab|cd} = 1 - 2/3 \exp(-t)$. The CF for the minor resolutions (in disagreement with the species tree $ab|cd$) would then be $CF_{ac|bd} = CF_{ad|bc} = 1/3 \exp(-t)$.


For the case of a 4-taxon network, the theoretical CFs are weighted averages of CFs on trees. For example, Figure 6 center shows a semi-directed 4-taxon and one possible rooting in Figure 6 left. The CFs on this network are given by the weighted averages of CF on the two trees on the right, with weights given by $1 - \gamma, \gamma$:

- $CF_{ab|cd} = (1 - \gamma)(1 - 2/3 \exp(-t_1)) + \gamma(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2))$ for the major resolution, and
- $CF_{ac|bd} = CF_{ad|bc} = (1 - \gamma)(1/3 \exp(-t_1)) + \gamma(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2))$ for the minor resolutions.


C.2 CF formulas for all possible level-1 4-taxon networks

Derived in [19], the theoretical CFs for the five types of level-1 4-taxon network are used in the computation of the pseudolikelihood of any level-1 network. These formulas appear in [19], but we re-write them here in Figure 7.


Note that there seems to be one type missing (type 1 with the direction of the hybrid edge flipped). This network, however, has the same theoretical CF formulas as the Type 2 network.




$$\begin{aligned}
 CF_{AB|CD} &= (1 - \gamma)^2(1 - 2/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2)) \\
 &\quad + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - \exp(-t_1) + 1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_3)) \\
 &\quad + \gamma^2(1 - 2/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_4)) \\
 CF_{AC|BD} &= (1 - \gamma)^2(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2)) \\
 &\quad + \gamma(1 - \gamma) \exp(-t_1)(1 - 1/3 \exp(-t_3)) \\
 &\quad + \gamma^2(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_4)) \\
 CF_{AD|BC} &= (1 - \gamma)^2(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2)) \\
 &\quad + \gamma(1 - \gamma) \exp(-t_1)(1 - 1/3 \exp(-t_3)) \\
 &\quad + \gamma^2(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_4))
 \end{aligned}$$




$$\begin{aligned}
 CF_{AB|CD} &= (1 - \gamma)(1 - 2/3 \exp(-t_1)) + \gamma(1 - 2/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2)) \\
 CF_{AC|BD} &= (1 - \gamma)1/3 \exp(-t_1) + \gamma 1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2) \\
 CF_{AD|BC} &= (1 - \gamma)1/3 \exp(-t_1) + \gamma 1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2)
 \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
 CF_{AB|CD} &= (1 - \gamma)(1 - 2/3 \exp(-t_1)) + \gamma(1/3 \exp(-t_2)) \\
 CF_{AC|BD} &= (1 - \gamma)1/3 \exp(-t_1) + \gamma(1 - 2/3 \exp(-t_2)) \\
 CF_{AD|BC} &= (1 - \gamma)1/3 \exp(-t_1) + \gamma 1/3 \exp(-t_2)
 \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
 CF_{AB|CD} &= (1 - \gamma)^2(1 - 2/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2 - t_3)) \\
 &\quad + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - 2/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2)) \\
 &\quad + \gamma^2(1 - 2/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2 - t_4)) \\
 CF_{AC|BD} &= (1 - \gamma)^2(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2 - t_3)) \\
 &\quad + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2)) \\
 &\quad + \gamma^2(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2 - t_4)) \\
 CF_{AD|BC} &= (1 - \gamma)^2(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2 - t_3)) \\
 &\quad + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2)) \\
 &\quad + \gamma^2(1/3 \exp(-t_1 - t_2 - t_4))
 \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
 CF_{AB|CD} &= 1 - 2/3 \exp(-t_1) \\
 CF_{AC|BD} &= 1/3 \exp(-t_1) \\
 CF_{AD|BC} &= 1/3 \exp(-t_1)
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 7: Five different semi-directed level-1 4-taxon networks with one hybridization event, up to tip re-labelling.

C.2.1 Equivalence to quarnet types in [10]

Note that our five quarnet types are related to the four quarnet types defined in [10] (their Figure 4).

In their work, [10] define four types of quarnets:

- their type 1 corresponds to a quartet, which is equivalent to our type 5,
- their type 2 is the undirected version of our type 1 and type 2,
- their type 3 is not any of our types as we are restricting to the case of only one hybridization,
- their type 4 corresponds to our type 3.

We have one extra type (type 4), since in [10], the authors suppress any parallel edges and thus, our type 4 corresponds to a quartet in [10].

D Figures and tables for proof of Theorem 1






Figure 8: 3-cycle network and its corresponding major tree (see Lemma 3 for justification on comparison to the major tree). We find solutions to the equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{z}, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w})$ that would imply that the same set of CFs could be produced by both the network \mathcal{N} and the tree \mathcal{T} . Here $z_i = \exp(-t_i)$ for branch length t_i in \mathcal{N} , and $w_i = \exp(-t'_i)$ for branch length t'_i in \mathcal{T} .




$$z_{1,2} = 1$$

$$(t_{1,2} = 0)$$




$$z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0$$

$$(t_1 = \infty, t_2 = \infty)$$




$$z_0 = 0, z_2 = 0$$

$$(t_0 = \infty, t_2 = \infty)$$




$$z_0 = 0, z_1 = 0$$

$$(t_0 = \infty, t_1 = \infty)$$



$$z_2 = 0 (t_2 = \infty)$$

$$(1 - \gamma)(z_{0,1} - 1) = \gamma(z_{0,2} + z_{1,2} - 2)$$



$$z_1 = 0 (t_1 = \infty)$$

$$\gamma(z_{0,2} - 1) = (1 - \gamma)(z_{1,2} + z_{0,1} - 2)$$

Figure 9: Non-detectable 3-cycles: Cases when the hybridization on a 3-cycle network is not detectable for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Note that infinite branch lengths refer to the case of no ILS, so for example, on the second network on the first row, all individuals from the subgraphs labeled n_1 and n_2 would have coalesced on an infinitely long branch, and thus, the subgraph triangles are replaced by nodes which represent $n_1 = n_2 = 1$. These cases with infinitely long branches violate the A1-A2 assumptions.

Table 1: Systems of CF polynomial equations for the case of $k_i = 3$. Here, $n = (n_0, n_1, n_2)$ in Figure 8, and “Type” corresponds to the type of quarnet in Figure 7.

n	Type	$CF(\mathcal{N}, z, \gamma)$	$CF(\mathcal{T}, w)$
(0, 2, 2)	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_{1,2}z_2$ $\frac{1}{3}z_1z_{1,2}z_2$ $\frac{1}{3}z_1z_{1,2}z_2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_2w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2w_1$
(1, 1, 2)	2	$(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_{1,2}\right) + \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_2z_{1,2} + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_2z_{1,2} + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_2$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2$
(1, 2, 1)	2	$(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1\right) + \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_{1,2}\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_1z_{1,2}$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_1z_{1,2}$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1$
(2, 0, 2)	4	$(1 - \gamma)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,1}\right) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0\right) + \gamma^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0z_{0,2}\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,1} + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_{0,2}$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,1} + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_{0,2}$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_2w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2w_0$
(2, 1, 1)	1	$(1 - \gamma)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_{0,1}\right) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - z_0 + \frac{1}{3}z_0z_{1,2}\right) + \gamma^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_{0,2}\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_{0,1} + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{3}z_{1,2}\right) + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_{0,2}$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_{0,1} + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{3}z_{1,2}\right) + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_{0,2}$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_0$
(2, 2, 0)	4	$(1 - \gamma)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0z_{0,1}\right) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0\right) + \gamma^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,2}\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_{0,1} + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,2}$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_{0,1} + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_{1,2}z_{0,2}$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1w_0$




Figure 10: 4-cycle network and its corresponding tree representation (see Lemma 3 for justification on comparison to a tree). We find solutions to the equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, z, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, w)$ that would imply that the same set of CFs could be produced by both the network \mathcal{N} and the tree \mathcal{T} . Note that we do not eliminate degree-2 nodes in the tree \mathcal{T} simply for ease of notation and comparison to \mathcal{N} . Here $z_i = \exp(-t_i)$ for branch length t_i in \mathcal{N} , and $w_i = \exp(-t'_i)$ in \mathcal{T} .




Figure 11: Left: Non-detectable 4-cycle network: Cases when the hybridization on a 4-cycle network is not detectable for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ correspond to the case when $t_{2,3} = 0$ in Figure 10 and thus, the 4-cycle becomes a 3-cycle. Right: Non-detectable k -cycle network ($k \geq 5$): Cases when the hybridization on a k -cycle network for $k \geq 5$ is not detectable for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ correspond to the case when $\tilde{t} = t_{2,4} = 0$ in Figure 12 and thus, the k -cycle becomes a 3-cycle.

Table 2: Systems of CF polynomial equations for the case of $k_i = 4$. Here we do not repeat the minor CF equations for the cases when there are two equal. Also, $n = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3)$ as in Figure 10, and “Type” corresponds to the type of quarnet in Figure 7.

n	Type	$CF(\mathcal{N}, z, \gamma)$	$CF(\mathcal{T}, w)$
$(0, 0, 2, 2)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_{2,3}z_3$ $\frac{1}{3}z_2z_{2,3}z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_2w_{2,3}w_3$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2w_{2,3}w_3$
$(0, 1, 2, 1)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_{2,3}z_2$ $\frac{1}{3}z_2z_{2,3}z_2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_2z_{2,3}w_2$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2z_{2,3}w_2$
$(0, 1, 1, 2)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3$ $\frac{1}{3}z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3$ $\frac{1}{3}w_3$
$(0, 2, 2, 0)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_{2,3}z_{1,3}z_1$ $\frac{1}{3}z_2z_{2,3}z_{1,3}z_1$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_2w_{2,3}w_{1,3}w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2w_{2,3}w_{1,3}w_1$
$(0, 2, 1, 1)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_{1,3}$ $\frac{1}{3}z_1z_{1,3}$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_{1,3}w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_{1,3}w_1$
$(0, 2, 0, 2)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3z_{1,3}z_1$ $\frac{1}{3}z_3z_{1,3}z_1$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3w_{1,3}w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_3w_{1,3}w_1$
$(1, 0, 2, 1)$	2	$(1 - \gamma)\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_{2,3}z_2\right) + \gamma\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_2z_{2,3}z_2 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_2z_{2,3}w_2$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2z_{2,3}w_2$
$(1, 0, 1, 2)$	2	$(1 - \gamma)\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3\right) + \gamma\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_{2,3}z_3\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_3 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2z_{2,3}z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3$ $\frac{1}{3}w_3$
$(1, 1, 2, 0)$	2	$(1 - \gamma)\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_{1,3}z_{2,3}z_2\right) + \gamma\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1z_{1,3}z_{2,3}z_2 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_{1,3}w_{2,3}w_2$ $\frac{1}{3}w_{1,3}w_{2,3}w_2$
$(1, 1, 1, 1)$	3	$(1 - \gamma)\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_{1,3}\right) + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_{2,3}$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_{1,3} + \gamma\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_{2,3}\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_{1,3} + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_{2,3}$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_{1,3}$ $\frac{1}{3}w_{1,3}$ $\frac{1}{3}w_{1,3}$

Table 3: Systems of CF polynomial equations for the case of $k_i = 4$. Here we do not repeat the minor CF equations for the cases when there are two equal. Also, $n = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3)$ as in Figure 10, and “Type” corresponds to the type of quartet in Figure 7.

n	Type	$CF(\mathcal{N}, z, \gamma)$	$CF(\mathcal{T}, w)$
(1, 1, 0, 2)	2	$(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1, 3z_3) + \gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3)$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1, 3w_3$
		$(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1, 3z_3 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_3$	$\frac{1}{3}w_1, 3w_3$
(1, 2, 1, 0)	2	$(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1) + \gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2, 3z_1, 3z_1)$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1$
		$(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2, 3z_1, 3z_1$	$\frac{1}{3}w_1$
(1, 2, 0, 1)	2	$(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1) + \gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1, 3z_1)$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1$
		$(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_1, 3z_1$	$\frac{1}{3}w_1$
(2, 0, 2, 0)	4	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0z_0, 1z_1, 3z_2, 3) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0) + \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0z_0, 2)$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_0w_0, 1w_1, 3w_2, 3w_2$
		$(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_0, 1z_1, 3z_2, 3 + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_0, 2$	$\frac{1}{3}w_0w_0, 1w_1, 3w_2, 3w_2$
(2, 0, 1, 1)	1	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_1, 3z_0, 1) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - z_0 + \frac{1}{3}z_0z_2, 3) + \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_0, 2)$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1, 3w_0, 1w_0$
		$(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_1, 3z_0, 1 + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - \frac{1}{3}z_2, 3) + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_0, 2$	$\frac{1}{3}w_1, 3w_0, 1w_0$
(2, 0, 0, 2)	4	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3z_0z_1, 3z_0, 1) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3z_0) + \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3z_0z_2, 3z_0, 2)$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3w_1, 3w_0, 1w_0$
		$(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_3z_0z_1, 3z_0, 1 + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_3z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_3z_0z_2, 3z_0, 2$	$\frac{1}{3}w_3w_1, 3w_0, 1w_0$
(2, 1, 1, 0)	1	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_0, 1) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - z_0 + \frac{1}{3}z_0z_2, 3z_1, 3) + \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_0, 2)$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_0, 1w_0$
		$(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_0, 1 + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - \frac{1}{3}z_2, 3z_1, 3) + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_0, 2$	$\frac{1}{3}w_0, 1w_0$
(2, 1, 0, 1)	1	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_0, 1) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - z_0 + \frac{1}{3}z_0z_1, 3) + \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_0, 2z_2, 3)$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_0, 1w_0$
		$(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_0, 1 + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - \frac{1}{3}z_1, 3) + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_0, 2z_2, 3$	$\frac{1}{3}w_0, 1w_0$
(2, 2, 0, 0)	4	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0z_0, 1) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0) + \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0z_0, 2z_2, 3z_1, 3)$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1w_0, 1w_0$
		$(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_0, 1 + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_0, 2z_2, 3z_1, 3$	$\frac{1}{3}w_1w_0, 1w_0$




Figure 12: 5-cycle network and its corresponding tree representation (see Lemma 3 for justification on comparison to tree). We find solutions to the equations $CF(\mathcal{N}, z, \gamma) = CF(\mathcal{T}, w)$ that would imply that the same set of CFs could be produced by both the network \mathcal{N} and the tree \mathcal{T} . The dotted path represent the possibility of a large cycle ($k > 5$) which by Lemma 4 has the same hybridization detectability properties. Note that we do not eliminate degree-2 nodes in the tree \mathcal{T} simply for ease of notation and comparison to \mathcal{N} . Here $z_i = \exp(-t_i)$ for branch length t_i in \mathcal{N} , and $w_i = \exp(-t'_i)$ for branch length t'_i in \mathcal{T} .

Table 4: Systems of CF polynomial equations for the case of $k_i \geq 5$. Here we do not repeat the minor CF equations for the cases when there are two equal. Also, $n = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4)$ as in Figure 12, and “Type” corresponds to the type of quartet in Figure 7.

$(0, 2, 0, 2, 0)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3z_1, z_1$ $\frac{1}{3}z_3z_1, z_1$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3w_1, z_3w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_3w_1, z_3w_1$
$(1, 1, 0, 2, 0)$	2	$(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1, z_3) + \gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1, z_3 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3w_1, z_3$ $\frac{1}{3}w_3w_1, z_3$
$(1, 2, 0, 1, 0)$	2	$(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1) + \gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1, z_1)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_1, z_1$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1$
$(2, 0, 0, 2, 0)$	4	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3z_0z_0, z_1, z_3) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3z_0)$ $+ \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3z_0z_0, z_2z_2, z_4z_4, z_6z_6, z_7z_5, z_7z_3, z_5)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_3z_0z_0, z_1, z_3 + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_3z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_3z_0z_0, z_2z_2, z_4z_4, z_6z_6, z_7z_5, z_7z_3, z_5$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3w_1, z_3w_0, z_1w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_3w_1, z_3w_0, z_1w_0$
$(2, 1, 0, 1, 0)$	1	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_0, z_1) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - z_0 + \frac{1}{3}z_0z_1, z_3) + \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_0, z_2z_2, z_4z_4, z_6z_6, z_7z_5, z_7z_3, z_5)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_0, z_1 + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - \frac{1}{3}z_1, z_3) + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_0, z_2z_2, z_4z_4, z_6z_6, z_7z_5, z_7z_3, z_5$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_0, z_1w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_0, z_1w_0$
$(2, 2, 0, 0, 0)$	4	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0z_0, z_1) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0) + \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1z_0z_0, z_2z_2, z_4z_4, z_6z_6, z_7z_5, z_7z_3, z_5, z_1, z_3)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_0, z_1 + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_1z_0z_0, z_2z_2, z_4z_4, z_6z_6, z_7z_5, z_7z_3, z_5, z_1, z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1w_0, z_1w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1w_0, z_1w_0$
$(0, 1, 1, 2, 0)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3$ $\frac{1}{3}z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3$ $\frac{1}{3}w_3$
$(0, 2, 1, 1, 0)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1, z_3$ $\frac{1}{3}z_1, z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1, z_3w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1, z_3w_1$
$(1, 0, 1, 2, 0)$	2	$(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3) + \gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2, z_4z_4, z_6z_6, z_7z_5, z_7z_3, z_5z_3)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_3 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2, z_4z_4, z_6z_6, z_7z_5, z_7z_3, z_5z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3$ $\frac{1}{3}w_3$
$(1, 1, 1, 1, 0)$	3	$(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1, z_3) + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2, z_4z_4, z_6z_6, z_7z_5, z_7z_3, z_5$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1, z_3 + \gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2, z_4z_4, z_6z_6, z_7z_5, z_7z_3, z_5)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1, z_3 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2, z_4z_4, z_6z_6, z_7z_5, z_7z_3, z_5$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1, z_3$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1, z_3$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1, z_3$

Table 5: Systems of CF polynomial equations for the case of $k_i \geq 5$. Here we do not repeat the minor CF equations for the cases when there are two equal. Also, $n = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4)$ as in Figure 12, and “Type” corresponds to the type of quartet in Figure 7.

$(1, 2, 1, 0, 0)$	2	$(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1) + \gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2, 4z_4, 6z_6, 7z_5, 7z_3, 5z_1, 3z_1)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2, 4z_4, 6z_6, 7z_5, 7z_3, 5z_1, 3z_1$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1$
$(2, 0, 1, 1, 0)$	1	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_1, 3z_0, 1) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - z_0 + \frac{1}{3}z_0z_2, 4z_4, 6z_6, 7z_5, 7z_3, 5) + \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_0, 2)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_1, 3z_0, 1 + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - \frac{1}{3}z_2, 4z_4, 6z_6, 7z_5, 7z_3, 5) + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_0, 2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1, 3w_0, 1w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1, 3w_0, 1w_0$
$(2, 1, 1, 0, 0)$	1	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_0, 1) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - z_0 + \frac{1}{3}z_0z_2, 4z_4, 6z_6, 7z_5, 7z_3, 5z_1, 3) + \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_0z_0, 2)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_0, 1 + \gamma(1 - \gamma)z_0(1 - \frac{1}{3}z_2, 4z_4, 6z_6, 7z_5, 7z_3, 5z_1, 3) + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_0z_0, 2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_0, 1w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_0, 1w_0$
$(0, 0, 2, 2, 0)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_2, 4z_4, 6z_6, 7z_5, 7z_3, 5z_3$ $\frac{1}{3}z_2z_2, 4z_4, 6z_6, 7z_5, 7z_3, 5z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_2w_2, 4w_4, 6w_6, 7w_5, 7w_3, 5w_3$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2w_2, 4w_4, 6w_6, 7w_5, 7w_3, 5w_3$
$(0, 1, 2, 1, 0)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3, 5z_5, 7z_6, 7z_4, 6z_2, 4z_2$ $\frac{1}{3}z_3, 5z_5, 7z_6, 7z_4, 6z_2, 4z_2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3, 5w_5, 7w_6, 7w_4, 6w_2, 4w_2$ $\frac{1}{3}w_3, 5w_5, 7w_6, 7w_4, 6w_2, 4w_2$
$(0, 2, 2, 0, 0)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_2, 4z_4, 6z_6, 7z_5, 7z_3, 5z_1, 3z_1$ $\frac{1}{3}z_2z_2, 4z_4, 6z_6, 7z_5, 7z_3, 5z_1, 3z_1$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_2w_2, 4w_4, 6w_6, 7w_5, 7w_3, 5w_1, 3w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2w_2, 4w_4, 6w_6, 7w_5, 7w_3, 5w_1, 3w_1$
$(1, 0, 2, 1, 0)$	2	$(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3, 5z_5, 7z_6, 7z_4, 6z_2, 4z_2) + \gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_3, 5z_5, 7z_6, 7z_4, 6z_2, 4z_2 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3, 5w_5, 7w_6, 7w_4, 6w_2, 4w_2$ $\frac{1}{3}w_3, 5w_5, 7w_6, 7w_4, 6w_2, 4w_2$
$(1, 1, 2, 0, 0)$	2	$(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1, 3z_3, 5z_5, 7z_6, 7z_4, 6z_2, 4z_2) + \gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_1, 3z_3, 5z_5, 7z_6, 7z_4, 6z_2, 4z_2 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1, 3w_3, 5w_5, 7w_6, 7w_4, 6w_2, 4w_2$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1, 3w_3, 5w_5, 7w_6, 7w_4, 6w_2, 4w_2$
$(2, 0, 2, 0, 0)$	4	$(1 - \gamma)^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0z_0, 1z_1, 3z_3, 5z_5, 7z_6, 7z_4, 6z_2, 4) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0) + \gamma^2(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_0z_0, 2)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_0, 1z_1, 3z_3, 5z_5, 7z_6, 7z_4, 6z_2, 4 + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0 + \gamma^2\frac{1}{3}z_2z_0z_0, 2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_2w_2, 4w_4, 6w_6, 7w_5, 7w_3, 5w_1, 3w_0, 1w_0$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2w_2, 4w_4, 6w_6, 7w_5, 7w_3, 5w_1, 3w_0, 1w_0$
$(0, 1, 0, 2, 1)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_3$ $\frac{1}{3}z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_3$ $\frac{1}{3}w_3$
$(0, 2, 0, 1, 1)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_1, 3z_1$ $\frac{1}{3}z_1, 3z_1$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_1, 3w_1$ $\frac{1}{3}w_1, 3w_1$

Table 6: Systems of CF polynomial equations for the case of $k_i \geq 5$. Here we do not repeat the minor CF equations for the cases when there are two equal. Also, $n = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4)$ as in Figure 12, and “Type” corresponds to the type of quartet in Figure 7.

$(1, 0, 0, 2, 1)$	2	$(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_3\right) + \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_3\right)$ $(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_3 + \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_3$ $\frac{1}{3} w_3$
$(1, 1, 0, 1, 1)$	3	$(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_{1,3}\right) + \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_{2,4}$ $(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_{1,3} + \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_{2,4}\right)$ $(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_{1,3} + \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_{2,4}$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_{1,3}$ $\frac{1}{3} w_{1,3}$ $\frac{1}{3} w_{1,3}$
$(1, 2, 0, 0, 1)$	2	$(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_1\right) + \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_1, 3 z_1\right)$ $(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_1 + \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_1, 3 z_1$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_1$ $\frac{1}{3} w_1$
$(2, 0, 0, 1, 1)$	1	$(1 - \gamma)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_0 z_0, 1 z_1, 3\right) + 2\gamma \left(1 - \gamma\right) \left(1 - z_0 + \frac{1}{3} z_0 z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5\right) + \gamma^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_0 z_0, 2 z_2, 4\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2 \frac{1}{3} z_0 z_0, 1 z_1, 3 + \gamma \left(1 - \gamma\right) z_0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5\right) + \gamma^2 \frac{1}{3} z_0 z_0, 2 z_2, 4$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_{1,3} w_{0,1} w_0$ $\frac{1}{3} w_{1,3} w_{0,1} w_0$
$(2, 1, 0, 0, 1)$	1	$(1 - \gamma)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_0 z_0, 1\right) + 2\gamma \left(1 - \gamma\right) \left(1 - z_0 + \frac{1}{3} z_0 z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_1, 3\right) + \gamma^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_0 z_0, 2 z_2, 4\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2 \frac{1}{3} z_0 z_0, 1 + \gamma \left(1 - \gamma\right) z_0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_1, 3\right) + \gamma^2 \frac{1}{3} z_0 z_0, 2 z_2, 4$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_{0,1} w_0$ $\frac{1}{3} w_{0,1} w_0$
$(0, 0, 1, 2, 1)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_3$ $\frac{1}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_3$ $\frac{1}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_3$
$(0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5$ $\frac{1}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5$ $\frac{1}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5$
$(0, 2, 1, 0, 1)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_1, 3 z_1$ $\frac{1}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_1, 3 z_1$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3 w_1$ $\frac{1}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3 w_1$
$(1, 0, 1, 1, 1)$	3	$(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5\right) + \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_{2,4}$ $(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 + \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_{2,4}\right)$ $(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 + \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_{2,4}$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5$ $\frac{1}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5$ $\frac{1}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5$
$(1, 1, 1, 0, 1)$	3	$(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_1, 3\right) + \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_{2,4}$ $(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_1, 3 + \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_{2,4}\right)$ $(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_{4,6} z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_1, 3 + \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_{2,4}$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3$ $\frac{1}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3$ $\frac{1}{3} w_{4,6} w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3$

Table 7: Systems of CF polynomial equations for the case of $k_i \geq 5$. Here we do not repeat the minor CF equations for the cases when there are two equal. Also, $n = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4)$ as in Figure 12, and “Type” corresponds to the type of quartet in Figure 7.

$(2, 0, 1, 0, 1)$	1	$(1 - \gamma)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_0 z_0, 1 z_1, 3 z_3, 5 z_5, 7 z_6, 7 z_4, 6\right) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - z_0 + \frac{1}{3} z_0 z_2, 4\right) + \gamma^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_0 z_0, 2\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2 \frac{1}{3} z_0 z_0, 1 z_1, 3 z_3, 5 z_5, 7 z_6, 7 z_4, 6 + \gamma(1 - \gamma) z_0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{3} z_2, 4\right) + \gamma^2 \frac{1}{3} z_0 z_0, 2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_4, 6 w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3 w_0, 1 w_0$ $\frac{1}{3} w_4, 6 w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3 w_0, 1 w_0$
$(0, 0, 2, 1, 1)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3} z_2, 4 z_2$ $\frac{1}{3} z_2, 4 z_2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_2, 4 w_2$ $\frac{1}{3} w_2, 4 w_2$
$(0, 1, 2, 0, 1)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3} z_2, 4 z_2$ $\frac{1}{3} z_2, 4 z_2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_2, 4 w_2$ $\frac{1}{3} w_2, 4 w_2$
$(1, 0, 2, 0, 1)$	2	$(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_2, 4 z_2\right) + \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_2\right)$ $(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_2, 4 z_2 + \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_2$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_2, 4 w_2$ $\frac{1}{3} w_2, 4 w_2$
$(0, 0, 0, 2, 2)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3} z_4 z_4, 6 z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_3$ $\frac{1}{3} z_4 z_4, 6 z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_3$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_4 w_4, 6 w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_3$ $\frac{1}{3} w_4 w_4, 6 w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_3$
$(0, 1, 0, 1, 2)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3} z_3, 5 z_5, 7 z_6, 7 z_4, 6 z_4$ $\frac{1}{3} z_3, 5 z_5, 7 z_6, 7 z_4, 6 z_4$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_3, 5 w_5, 7 w_6, 7 w_4, 6 w_4$ $\frac{1}{3} w_3, 5 w_5, 7 w_6, 7 w_4, 6 w_4$
$(0, 2, 0, 0, 2)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3} z_4 z_4, 6 z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_1, 3 z_1$ $\frac{1}{3} z_4 z_4, 6 z_6, 7 z_5, 7 z_3, 5 z_1, 3 z_1$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_4 w_4, 6 w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3 w_1$ $\frac{1}{3} w_4 w_4, 6 w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3 w_1$
$(1, 0, 0, 1, 2)$	2	$(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_3, 5 z_5, 7 z_6, 7 z_4, 6 z_4\right) + \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_4\right)$ $(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_3, 5 z_5, 7 z_6, 7 z_4, 6 z_4 + \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_4$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_3, 5 w_5, 7 w_6, 7 w_4, 6 w_4$ $\frac{1}{3} w_3, 5 w_5, 7 w_6, 7 w_4, 6 w_4$
$(1, 1, 0, 0, 2)$	2	$(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_1, 3 z_3, 5 z_5, 7 z_6, 7 z_4, 6 z_4\right) + \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_4\right)$ $(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_1, 3 z_3, 5 z_5, 7 z_6, 7 z_4, 6 z_4 + \gamma \frac{1}{3} z_4$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_4 w_4, 6 w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3$ $\frac{1}{3} w_4 w_4, 6 w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3$
$(2, 0, 0, 0, 2)$	4	$(1 - \gamma)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_4 z_0 z_0, 1 z_1, 3 z_3, 5 z_5, 7 z_6, 7 z_4, 6\right) + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} z_4 z_0 z_0, 2 z_2, 4\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)^2 \frac{1}{3} z_4 z_0 z_0, 1 z_1, 3 z_3, 5 z_5, 7 z_6, 7 z_4, 6 + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{3} z_4 z_0 z_0 + \gamma^2 \frac{1}{3} z_4 z_0 z_0, 2 z_2, 4$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_4 w_4, 6 w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3 w_0, 1 w_0$ $\frac{1}{3} w_4 w_4, 6 w_6, 7 w_5, 7 w_3, 5 w_1, 3 w_0, 1 w_0$
$(0, 0, 1, 1, 2)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3} z_4$ $\frac{1}{3} z_4$	$1 - \frac{2}{3} w_4$ $\frac{1}{3} w_4$

Table 8: Systems of CF polynomial equations for the case of $k_i \geq 5$. Here we do not repeat the minor CF equations for the cases when there are two equal. Also, $n = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4)$ as in Figure 12, and “Type” corresponds to the type of quarnet in Figure 7.

$(0, 1, 1, 0, 2)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_4$ $\frac{1}{3}z_4$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_4$ $\frac{1}{3}w_4$
$(1, 0, 1, 0, 2)$	2	$(1 - \gamma)\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_4\right) + \gamma\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}z_{2,4}z_4\right)$ $(1 - \gamma)\frac{1}{3}z_4 + \gamma\frac{1}{3}z_{2,4}z_4$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_4$ $\frac{1}{3}w_4$
$(0, 0, 2, 0, 2)$	Tree	$1 - \frac{2}{3}z_2z_{2,4}z_4$ $\frac{1}{3}z_2z_{2,4}z_4$	$1 - \frac{2}{3}w_2w_{2,4}w_4$ $\frac{1}{3}w_2w_{2,4}w_4$